

# Administering Agricultural Development

(Coordination, Initiative, and Communication  
in Three North Indian States)

A. P. BARNABAS  
DONALD C. PELZ

*in collaboration with*

Departments of Public Administration  
of

Lucknow University, Panjab University, Rajasthan University



THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION  
INDRAPRASTHA ESTATE, RING ROAD, NEW DELHI, INDIA

© THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION  
NEW DELHI

MARCH 1970

PRICE : INDIA : Rs. 10.00  
OVERSEAS : \$ 4  
30 sh.

## FOREWORD

About seventy per cent of the rural population is dependent on agriculture for their living. The agricultural industry in India has been proverbially called "A gamble on the Monsoon". The efforts to lessen the dependence on the vagaries of nature have had only partial success. Much more has yet to be accomplished to be able to develop confidence in the achievement in the agricultural field. This is not to deny or belittle the achievements in the field of agriculture in the last two decades. The production has gone up from about 50 million tonnes to about 90 million tonnes in the good years. Nevertheless, this achievement has failed to provide a sustained confidence in being able to fulfil the needs of the country.

There are many variables which affect the agricultural production. As has already been indicated one is nature. The other is the administrative organisation. There have been efforts to streamline the administrative structure. The improvement which has been attempted is in one sense a recognition of the inadequacy of the institutional set-up to meet the enlarging needs of introducing quick innovations in the field of agriculture. It also must be admitted that the attempt at improving the administrative set-up has been based by and large on subjective evaluation of the functioning rather than on information collected through objective and systematic study.

Two major criticisms regarding the agricultural administration have generally been made. One refers to the lack of coordination among the departments which must work together to achieve agricultural development.

The other is that the administrators do not take sufficient initiative to get the programmes going. The need for delegation of power to the lower echelons in the administrative hierarchy has also been mentioned. In other words the question raised is

“Do the administrators at all levels have the power to take the necessary initiative to make the programme work?”

The poor performance in the field of agriculture has thus been laid on the twin problems of lack of coordination and initiative in the administrative set-up. However, there has been little empirical study to examine this criticism. The present study is an attempt to locate the specific problems in the field of coordination and innovative behaviour in the administration. It is not merely to locate the weak point but also to study what factors are responsible for the particular behaviour. This approach naturally meant that coordination and initiative could not be looked at only from an institutional point of view but also from the viewpoint of the human relationships involved. In effective coordination, a complex set of human relationships as well as a wide network of communications are involved. Essentially what the authors were trying to do is to see what steps can be taken in the administrative machinery which may prove helpful in maximising agricultural production. It is from this point of view that they have tried to examine the views of the cultivators as well as those of the administrators and non-officials regarding the present agricultural programmes with respect to supplies, coordination, communication and initiative. It is hoped that the objective analysis would help in a greater understanding of all the factors involved in agricultural administration and strengthening the weak links.

NEW DELHI  
NOVEMBER 1969.

J. N. KHOSLA,  
*Director,*  
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC  
ADMINISTRATION

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Survey reported here was a part of a programme to develop survey research facilities at the Indian Institute of Public Administration and selected universities for conducting systematic and scientific studies in Development Administration in India. This programme was operative during the years 1963-66.

The University of Michigan's Survey Research Centre deputed Dr. Donald C. Pelz under a contract with the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), as an Advisor to the Indian Institute of Public Administration to get the programme of survey research going and to develop relations with other universities. USAID also provided financial assistance.

As a part of this programme, a training course was held in the first half of 1965 in which there were participants from the universities of Lucknow, Rajasthan and Punjab. They conducted a pilot study on coordination in agricultural administration. This in turn provided the basic working hypotheses and frame of reference for the present study, which covers a larger sample in three states and incorporates refinements in the pattern of questioning.

Our thanks are due to the three heads of departments of Public Administration—Dr. R. B. Das of Lucknow University, Dr. Ziauddin Khan of Rajasthan University and Dr. B. S. Khanna of Panjab University. They and their departments have not only collaborated in the training programme but also were actively associated in conducting the study. They also served on the Advisory Committee, along with representatives from the Planning Commission, the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation and the evaluation organizations of Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh. The respective State Development departments gave generous help in the sampling and interviewing phases.

We are also grateful for the sustained interest and encouragement shown in this whole programme by the University Grants Commission and by the Director of the Institute, Dr. J. N. Khosla.

Valuable contributions have been made in all phases of this report by Shri S. Satyamurthi, Research Assistant, for the programme. It would have been very difficult to have produced this report without his help.

NEW DELHI

A. P. BARNABAS

DONALD C. PELZ

# CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD ... ..	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ... ..	vii
I. INTRODUCTION ... ..	1
II. AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMMES ... ..	9
III. COORDINATION ... ..	39
IV. INITIATIVE ... ..	60
V. COMMUNICATION ... ..	75
VI. CONCLUSIONS ... ..	92
APPENDIX I. A STUDY OF AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES	
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CULTIVATORS ...	110
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR OFFICIALS AND NON-OFFICIALS	124



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Increasing agricultural production is a basic component of the development of India. Thus it is the legitimate concern of major government sectors. At the state level, at least six departments are performing different but inter-related activities with the common objective of increasing agricultural production. Maximum impact, of course, requires effective coordination, communication, and initiative. There are other variables, but these could be considered fundamental in administrative study.

Administrative inefficiency in executing agricultural programmes has been recognised at the highest levels of Government as contributing to the frustrating shortfalls in achieving agricultural production targets. Growing concern has been expressed over the lack of coordination between different agencies, restricted by their departmental rules and procedures. For example, emphasising that the "problem of increasing agricultural production in India is more an administrative problem than a technical one",<sup>1</sup> the Raja of Nalagarh Committee observed that "a streamlined agricultural administration is an urgent necessity and the food situation of the country can be appreciably increased if positive steps are taken to achieve this objective. Administrative lapses have universally contributed towards shortfalls in implementation of agricultural schemes and thereby directly caused shortfalls in agricultural production".<sup>2</sup> The Committee's report has drawn specific attention to the "gross lack of coordination between the Irrigation and Agricultural Departments both at the level of planning and execution in the field",<sup>3</sup> resulting in underutilisation

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Report of the Agricultural Administration Committee, Ministry of Food & Agriculture, New Delhi, October, 1958, p. 4* (hereafter referred to as the Raja of Nalagarh Committee Report).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 34.

of irrigation resources. Hence it stressed that "the Departments of Irrigation, Cooperation and Agriculture and the common Extension Agency of CD should work as a team, with the sole object of assisting the farmer to intensify production".<sup>4</sup>

The Central Teams on Agricultural Production that visited the states during April-June, 1963, concluded that "unsatisfactory administrative and organisational arrangements were, by far, the most single factor responsible for inadequate progress in the sphere of agricultural production".<sup>5</sup> The teams further stated that "the gaps and deficiencies arising from diffused and divided responsibility and lack of definition of relationship between different agencies and organs dealing with inter-related and inter-dependent aspects of the same programme, called for immediate and careful attention".<sup>6</sup>

The problem of coordination in agriculture again figured prominently at the Annual Conference of State Ministers of Community Development and Panchayati Raj held in 1963. The ministers emphasised that there should be close coordination and harmonious relations among all departments for the purpose of implementing agricultural programmes on a priority basis. The Conference set up a working group with Shri Ram Subhag Singh, the then Union Minister of Agriculture, as chairman to go into the whole question of administration and coordination. This group was specially requested to "review the existing arrangements and suggest concrete measures for bringing about adequate coordination within the entire administrative and organisational structure, from village level to the level of the Development Commissioner".<sup>7</sup>

The working group recommended at the state, district, and block levels a series of integrated Agricultural Production Departments or Committees, each headed by an appropriate official, to coordinate the activities of all relevant departments

---

<sup>4</sup> The Report of the Agricultural Administrative Committee, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

<sup>5</sup> Quoted in *Report of the Working Group on Inter-departmental and Institutional Coordination for Agricultural Production*, Ministry of Food & Agriculture, New Delhi, 1963, p. 1.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 2.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3.

at that level. The structures were to be linked with higher or lower levels by suitable representation.

Unfortunately none of these committee reports and seminars have examined the problem of coordination in depth. The problem of bringing about adequate coordination appears to have been realised vaguely but analyses and suggested solutions are not convincing. These reports sometimes give the impression that coordination can be achieved by creating additional posts or committees. But, as pointed out by the Nalagarh Committee, "Committees set up for achieving coordination have tended to function in a routine manner".<sup>8</sup> The reports have not explained why various departments have failed to coordinate the different but inter-related activities. Is it because departments do not share fully the common goal of increased agricultural production and thus work in watertight compartments? Is the traditional communication pattern between functionaries ineffective in achieving coordination? Do functionaries charged with the responsibility of implementing the programmes show inadequate initiative? Perhaps shortcomings in these factors—coordination, communication and initiative—individually and collectively contribute to poor performance on the agricultural front.

Because of this combination of valid concern and lack of satisfactory empirical analyses and indicated directions for improvement, coordination in agricultural programmes was chosen for a systematic study through the use of survey research techniques. This may be the first survey to study agricultural administration as a problem in organisational behaviour.

By definition, an organisation consists of a set of individuals operating together within a system for the realisation of a common objective. Explanations for the lack of coordination between departments purportedly working toward such a common objective, and solutions for shortcomings, have to be sought in terms of the interactions of functionaries, their methods of communication, frequency of contact, their perception of the effectiveness of the communication methods used by them, and other factors materially affecting their performance.

<sup>8</sup> Donald C. Pelz, "Coordination and Communication in Agricultural Development", *The Indian Journal of Public Administration*, 1966, Vol. XII, pp. 18-27.

The concept of coordination assumes some network of functionaries (either individuals or departments or other units) who perform a series of inter-related activities, the effect of which is to accomplish some end result (such as growing more food). In such a network, coordination is good if each person performs his activities in the right way and at the right time so that other persons in turn can perform their own activity, and the end result can be accomplished. Coordination is poor if some person fails to perform his activities in the right way or at the right time, and thus hinders the activities of other persons and achievement of the target. For smooth coordination it is necessary to have effective communication among the interacting parts of the network, whether by writing, meetings, personal contacts or other means. It is not enough that each person simply follows instructions. From time to time he must use discretion in handling problems, and must constantly look for better ways of doing his job. Such action may be called initiative.

### *The Research Design*

Operational study of the factors affecting coordination and initiative in agricultural administration, and the role of communication pattern in promoting or hindering them, involves obtaining answers to at least nine sets of questions:

(1) How far are the cultivators receiving the following inputs of the quantity and quality needed, and at the time needed:

- |                                  |                            |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| (i) Chemical fertilizers         | (v) Water from canal       |
| (ii) Improved seeds              | (vi) Pesticides            |
| (iii) Loans                      | (vii) Electricity          |
| (iv) Water from minor irrigation | (viii) Improved implements |
|                                  | (ix) Drainage              |

(2) What difficulties do cultivators face in the system of supply for each input? How complex are these systems, and how does complexity affect efficiency?

(3) How effective is *communication* among the system of officials and non-officials who carry out agricultural programmes in districts, blocks, and villages? How often and through what channels do these persons contact each other? At what points does communication break down?

(4) Many kinds of activities are required in agricultural development, such as planning, sanctioning, implementing, reporting, and evaluation. What are the common delays or bottlenecks in each of these activities ?

(5) Which particular officials and non-officials work together well in agricultural programmes ? Which ones work together poorly ?

(6) How far do various departments and non-official bodies direct their activities toward the goal of agricultural output, or toward other goals ?

(7) How much initiative is being exerted by the different officials and non-officials in the development network ? What are the obstacles to initiative, and how can the scope for it be improved ?

(8) How effectively are Agricultural Production Committees (if any) seen to be working in the districts and blocks ?

(9) What are the reasons for strengths and weaknesses in coordination within the main agricultural programmes mentioned above ? What suggestions are offered for their improvement ?

### *Pilot Survey*

A pilot survey on this topic was conducted during April-May 1965.<sup>9</sup> One district in each of the three states of Punjab, Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan and three blocks in each of these districts constituted the sample. Interviews were held with the officials and non-officials at district, block, and village levels concerned with agricultural programmes. A broad objective of the pilot study was to find out at what points in the network the degree of coordination was seen to be relatively strong or weak, by respondents holding responsible positions within the system. Besides coordination, the pilot study examined the communication methods and the scope for initiative.

Among the major findings of the pilot survey, the most important one concerned the effect of the communication pattern at

<sup>9</sup> This study is described in detail in Donald C. Pelz, *Coordination, Communication and Initiative in Agricultural Development: A Pilot Survey in one District each of Rajasthan, Punjab and Uttar Pradesh*, Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi, January 1966 (unpriced).

the block level on the extent of coordination and initiative. It was found that good coordination and the best initiative occurred where the communication pattern between block functionaries relies heavily on personal contacts plus formal meetings (with little writing).

In the course of analysis of pilot survey data many problems came to light. To analyse these problems in depth as well as in breadth, the present survey, with a sample over six times, as large, was undertaken during September-December, 1965. This follow-up study attempts to provide more definitive answers to questions raised by the pilot survey.

### *Sample*

The survey was conducted in the same three States of Punjab (then including Haryana), Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan. The districts within each State were first stratified according to physical or cultural characteristics affecting agricultural production. Different criteria for stratification were used in each of the three States as no one set provided a rational basis for uniform stratification in all the three states. The package programme districts, the district affected by the Indo-Pakistani conflict and those covered by the pilot survey were excluded. In one State the basis of stratification was the region. In another, the level of agricultural development was the stratification factor. In the third, stratification was based on rainfall, irrigation, etc. The method of "probability proportional to size", that is, according to number of blocks in each district was used in selecting one district from each stratum. In all, nine districts from three States were selected.

Twenty-seven blocks were selected for the whole sample. Blocks in each of the selected districts were placed in rank order according to level of important programmes like fertilizer and improved seeds, or other indices. The required number of blocks were then selected from high, medium, and low levels of development, on a "systematic random sampling" basis. Since the strata from which the districts were selected differed in size, an unusually large stratum was represented by four blocks (from the selected districts), an unusually small stratum by two.

Within each block one VLW circle was selected randomly.

Within each circle one gram panchayat was randomly selected, with probability proportional to size (defined as the estimated number of cultivators).

Within each gram panchayat (which may consist of one or more villages) ten cultivators were selected. A list of cultivator households in order of the size of land holding for each family was prepared for each gram panchayat selected. From these lists, cultivators (heads of households) were selected on a "systematic random sampling" basis. The cultivators' sample numbered 276.

All officials<sup>10</sup> and non-officials<sup>10</sup> having some responsibility for agricultural programmes at district, tehsil, block, and village levels were interviewed. Although the potential list contained 792 positions, the actual sample consisted of 650 respondents—401 officials and 249 non-officials.

### *Data Collection*

A detailed questionnaire was designed. One objective was to find out which functionaries contacted by the respondents were seen to be prompt in acting on their requests and how this promptness of action is affected by the frequency and patterns of communication methods used. In addition, the respondents were asked whether each functionary contacted by them took initiative in performing his job. Further, the functionaries were asked to evaluate the main programmes in their district-blocks.

Another schedule was framed for the cultivators' sample. They were asked similar questions about the organisations or functionaries contacted by them for help in farming matters. More important, they were asked about the actual use of various inputs and their views on the adequacy of these inputs in terms of quantities, quality and timeliness, etc.

<sup>10</sup>The term "official" customarily applies to employees of Central or State administrative departments. The term "non-official" designates members of national or state legislatures, or of self-government councils at the level of the district (Zila Parishad), block (Panchayat Samiti or simply Samiti), and village (Gram Panchayat) and to representatives of Cooperative Societies and other voluntary associations. Officials and non-officials together are sometimes called "office-bearers". In this report we shall designate both as "functionaries".

The combination of responses from officials, non-officials and cultivators was intended to give an indication of the end result of good coordination—effectiveness of various agricultural programmes.

## CHAPTER II

### AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMMES

Agricultural production is dependent on adequate and timely supplies of inputs. About 75 per cent of the cultivators who used fertilizers and improved seeds were satisfied with the supply situation, as well as the administrative procedures in obtaining them. As regards irrigation facilities and loans, a great deal of dissatisfaction was indicated by the cultivators. The Planning Department and the Panchayat Samitis were viewed as of considerable help in carrying out agricultural programmes. The present chapter discusses these dimensions of the agricultural programmes.

#### *Inputs and Satisfaction*

The cultivators were asked whether they had used each of several inputs during the year. They were further asked whether they needed the input or not. Table 2.1 summarises replies to these questions.

The number of cultivators who used these inputs is relatively small. Chemical fertilizer was used by a little more than half the cultivators (55%), water from wells by half, and improved seeds by about two-fifths of them.

More significant from the agricultural programme point of view are those who said they needed these inputs but could not get them and those who said they did not need them at all. Least deprivation was felt in regard to chemical fertilizers and improved seed (fewer than 1 in 7 felt they could not get what they needed). With regard to pesticides, drainage facilities, improved implements and minor irrigation, from one-fifth to one-third felt moderate deprivation. Severe deprivation (half of all cultivators) was felt in regard to electricity and major irrigation.

The need for augmenting the supplies of several inputs and

TABLE 2.1

AGRICULTURAL INPUTS USED OR NOT AVAILABLE IN 1964-65 : VIEWS  
OF 276 CULTIVATORS

	<i>Used Input*</i>	<i>Needed but not available</i>	<i>Did not need; not answered</i>	<i>Total</i>
Chemical fertilizer	55%	6%	39%	100%
Improved seed	38†	13	49	100
Pesticides	36	20	44	100
Drainage	10	20	70	100
Improved implements	27	28	45	100
Water from wells (minor irrigation)	50	29	21	100
Electricity	7	49	44	100
Water from canals (major irrigation)	16	50	34	100

\*Including those who received less than needed, or late, or wrong kind.

†Including 7 per cent who obtained improved seed from own or neighbouring farms.

providing them as a "package" to the cultivators and coordinating the activities of various departments is obvious.

A sizable number of the cultivators (ranging from 39% to 70%) said they did not need fertilizers, improved seeds, pesticides, electricity, improved implements, or drainage for their agricultural operation. Possibly, they are not motivated to improve their agricultural practices and perhaps lack of information is a contributory factor. May be their experience was not happy and they had given up trying. This would indicate that there is not only wider scope for extension education but a greater responsibility rests on government agencies, particularly the Block administration and the Panchayati Raj institutions in motivating the farmer to adopt improved practices.

There is yet another dimension to the problem of increasing

agricultural output. An index of modernisation of agriculture is provided by the amount of fertilizers and improved seeds used in cultivation.

Nearly three-fifths of those who used fertilizers cultivated less than 5 acres each. Seventy per cent of these used only less than 100 kg. of chemical fertilizers for the entire area cultivated by each of them during 1964-65.

In the case of improved seeds, only about two-thirds (0.65) of their total area was sown with improved seeds among those who used it. Among all cultivators whether using it or not, it appears that improved seed was used for about one-quarter (.25) of all seed requirements. Improved seed was mainly used for one crop and that too for wheat (31%) and next for sugarcane (13%).

However, these figures seem to suggest that much needs to be done in persuading farmers to use more of chemical fertilizers and improved varieties of seeds in as many important crops as possible.

#### *Adequacy of Specific Inputs as Reported by Cultivators*

Among those who said they needed chemical fertilizer, three-quarters or more (74—81%) were satisfied about getting the right quantity or kind, or on time. A slightly smaller number (67—70%) were satisfied with improved seeds in these respects. In the case of other inputs, satisfaction was much lower.

#### *Source of Funds for Purchase of Fertilizers and Improved Seeds*

The major source of funds (60%) for buying fertilizer was a loan (cash or credit). For improved seeds, however, the major source (58%) was cash. A large majority (75%) of cultivators obtained fertilizers through a cooperative society, while improved seed was obtained almost equally through a cooperative (36%), a government department (27%) and their own or nearby farm.

#### *Cash Loans*

The cultivators were asked whether they needed cash loan for purposes other than fertilizers and seeds and had applied for

TABLE 2.2

CULTIVATORS' SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION REGARDING THE SUPPLY OF INPUTS NEEDED BY THEM

	Satisfied & Obtained			Less Than Needed	Dissatisfied		Needed But Not Available	Number Who Needed
	Right Quantity	Right Quality	Right Time		Wrong Quality	Late		
Chemical fertilizer	74%	81%	80%	13%	7%	8%	10%	167
Improved seed*	67	70	70	8	5	5	25	141
Water from wells			32		32†	29	38	217
Pesticides	27%†		51		5	7	41	155
Improved imple- ments	31		32		13	14	54	153
Drainage	16		16		11	9	68	81
Water from canals (major irrigation)	5		6		17	9	77	183
Electricity	4		6		3	2	91	154

\*Including those who obtained from own or neighbouring farms.

†For remaining inputs, quantity and kind were not separated.

it. Only a little more than a third (36%) applied for cash loans during the past two years. Another 17 per cent said that they wanted a cash loan but did not apply—as they saw no hope of getting one or lacked the necessary influence. Nearly half the sample (45%) said that they never wanted cash loans.

Among those who had applied for cash loans, nearly two-thirds had received the full amount applied for, while a slightly less than one-fifth (18%) said that the amount received was less than applied for. Roughly one in seven of the applications was either still pending or rejected.

The single major purpose in obtaining cash loans was stated to be the purchase of animals (35%). Others less frequently mentioned were—improved seeds (17%), construction of wells and tubewells (15%). Purchase of improved implements was stated by a very few persons (2%). Non-agricultural purposes—food, clothing, housing, etc., was stated by 12 per cent.

Nearly half (46%) of the cash loans were obtained from a Cooperative Society, and one-third from a Government department. Whereas a larger number (74-81%) of cultivators was satisfied with regard to the adequacy of fertilizer and seed, fewer than half (43%) of those who wanted or applied for cash loan said that they received the full amount and on time.

### *Complexity and Delay (Procedures and Supplies)*

Nearly two-thirds of cultivators using fertilizers and improved seeds obtained within a week. Only one in eight (6-14%) waited three weeks or more. For a cash loan, on the other hand, the waiting time was considerably longer. Only about one-third (37%) obtained a loan in less than one week, while three in ten had to wait one to two months or more.

Whether the amount of delay in getting these inputs had any relation to the complexity of the procedures was examined. The cultivator was asked how he went about getting each input, what persons and organisations he contacted. These descriptions were scored in number of steps. Each 'step' refers to one functionary or agency performing any action. Only one-quarter of cultivators obtained fertilizer in a single step—*i.e.*, directly from

TABLE 2.3  
NUMBER OF STEPS TO OBTAIN INPUTS, IN RELATION TO TOTAL TIME TAKEN

<i>Time taken to obtain</i>	<i>One Step</i>	<i>Two Steps</i>	<i>Three or More Steps*</i>	<i>Max. diff.</i>
<i>Fertilizer</i>				
Less than one week	92%	51%	52%	41
One or two weeks	—	27	15	
Three-four weeks; one month	—	11 } 15	12 } 27	
Two months or more	—	4	15	
Doesn't remember	8	7	6	
	100%	100%	100%	
Number (out of 151 using fertilizer)	(39)	(79)	(33)	
<i>Improved Seed</i>				
Less than one week	83%	62%	64%	21
One or two weeks	3	27	9	
Three weeks or more	6	3	9	
Doesn't remember	8	8	18	
	100%	100%	100%	
Number (out of 84 using improved seed)	(36)	(37)	(11)	

*Cash Loan*

Less than one week	50%	32%	33%	18
One or two weeks	10	8	15	
Three-four weeks; one month	15	22	14	
Two months or more	10	16	12	
Application rejected—pending	15	22	26	
Application rejected—don't know				
	100%	100%	100%	
Number (out of 99 who applied for loan)	(20)	(37)	(42)	

\*Including those uncertain of number of steps.

the source of supply. A little more than one-half mentioned two steps.

Improved seed was more likely to be obtained directly (43% did so), but a cash loan was even less likely to be obtained in one step (20% did so). Improved seed took the fewest steps, and a loan the most. One-fifth of the cultivators used three or more steps to get fertilizers, and one-quarter used this many to get a cash loan.

The number of steps involved made a difference in the time taken for obtaining the input. Almost all (92%) of those who got fertilizers within a week had to go through one step only. When two or more steps were involved, only about half (51%) got it within a week. For improved seed, the percentages were 83 and 62 and for loans 50 and 32.

These data indicate that from the point of view of administrative action, simplification of procedure with fewer steps for supplying agricultural inputs would be helpful.

Again one has the impression of complexity resulting in delay when the cultivators who did not obtain the inputs in one step mentioned the persons and agencies involved in getting them. The VLW was more frequently mentioned (56% mentioned him) in securing fertilizers. He was also mentioned more than any other functionary in getting improved seed (25%), although the cultivator was more likely to get the input directly from the source (43%).

In the case of cash loans, the Patwari was most often mentioned (20%). Another important contact was the village Panchayat or its Sarpanch (18%), through whom a taccavi application was normally channelled. The VLW, cooperative society, and Cooperative Bank were also mentioned by a number of cultivators.

Too many functionaries seem to be involved in sanctioning a cash loan. May be the loan procedures could be simplified.

#### *Cultivators' Difficulties in Getting Inputs, and Reasons for not Using Them*

In discussing the adequacy of different programmes, cultivators mentioned a number of difficulties in getting adequate supplies on time, and the reasons for not using them.

In fertilizer programmes, the main difficulties were simply lack of sufficient or timely supplies and poor quality, etc. When cultivators who wanted to use fertilizers were asked why they had not, one-third of them said they could not get supplies. But more important, four out of ten (38%) said they did not use fertilizers because they were not sure of adequate irrigation water, either from wells or canals. Inadequacy of irrigation was seen as a major obstacle to the success of fertilizer programmes.

Inadequate supplies and the high cost of improved seeds were the major problems in the case of improved seeds programmes.

In the case of cash loans, cultivators' difficulties were attributed mainly to administrative procedures. The procedures for getting loans were more complex than those for other inputs. A further difficulty concerned partisanship or corruption on the part of officials. Although some cultivators wanted cash loans yet they did not apply because of high interest rates or delays (33%) and red tape (12%). Also about a fifth (17%) felt it was not worth trying to get a loan.

### *Evaluation of Officials and Non-officials*

Early in the interview with officials and non-officials, respondents were asked to name up to three agricultural programmes which were important in their district. Toward the end they were asked how well various persons or departments in their block/district worked together in each of these programmes.

The most important programmes according to the respondents were fertilizers, and minor irrigation (shown in last column of Table 2.4), with improved seed third in importance. But whereas about half the functionaries viewed fertilizer distribution as mostly well coordinated, over half (54%) saw partial or poor coordination in improved seed programmes, and even more (61%) were dissatisfied with minor irrigation.

Electricity and major irrigation were spontaneously mentioned by few functionaries as among the top three programmes in their

TABLE 2.4

HOW WELL FUNCTIONARIES HAVE WORKED TOGETHER IN AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMMES\*  
(650 OFFICIALS AND NON-OFFICIALS COMBINED)

	Mostly well	Sometimes well or poorly	Difference	Number answering	Percentage mentioning
1. † Fertilizer	51%	43%	8%	547	90%
2. † Minor irrigation	34	61	-27	544	88
3. † Improved seed	40	54	-14	378	69
4. † Loans	46	46	0	114	22
5. † Pesticides	41	51	-10	78	18
6. Improved implements	38	53	-15	56	16
7. Major/canal irrigation	26	58	-32	38	10
8. Electricity	8	84	-76	25	10

\*Toward the end of the interview each respondent was asked (Q. 19), in regard to three main programmes he had mentioned earlier: "In general, how far the various persons or departments in your block/district have worked together well in this programme—that is, how far each of them had done the needed things on time?" Respondent chose among the alternatives: "Mostly worked together well; sometimes well, sometimes not; often worked together poorly." Inputs are listed in order of the difference, third column. Not shown are small percentages who had no opinion (usually 5–15%).

†At an early point (Q. 2) the interviewer named five programmes daggered above and asked: "In your opinion, what are the more important programmes for agricultural development in this district?" The five listed programmes of course were more likely to be mentioned by respondents as important (last column). Officials and non-officials were similar in their ratings of importance.

district. Among these the percentages dissatisfied were at least double the number of those who are satisfied.

On most of the programmes, non-officials were somewhat more critical than officials, as shown in Table 2.5. On major irrigation the difference was striking. Among the few officials mentioning this, half reported smooth coordination, while among the few non-officials who mentioned it, all were critical. This result suggests a blind spot. Officials perhaps were unaware of the deep dissatisfaction among non-officials regarding major irrigation programmes.

*Reasons for various programmes working smoothly or poorly*

In the preceding section, the opinions of officials and non-officials as to how far "various persons or departments in your block/district have *worked together well*" in the two or three agricultural programmes which each respondent thought most important in his area were shown. Respondents were also asked for what reasons they thought good or poor coordination had occurred in each programme, with an example.

The reasons for agricultural programmes working smoothly mentioned more frequently are summarised in Table 2.6, and reasons for their working poorly in Table 2.7.

In every programme except loans, poor functioning was attributed to *inadequate inputs* than on any other factor. Credit for working smoothly, however, was about equally spread among three main factors: adequate inputs, institutional assets, and personal attitudes of officials.

With regard to fertilizer programmes, well over half of the reasons for poor functioning (59%) referred to inadequate inputs—mainly insufficient or late supplies. Where various persons worked together well in such programmes, both adequate inputs and high interest on the part of officials were mentioned by one quarter of the people.

Some of the verbatim responses are indicative of the feelings of the respondents. As regards inadequate supplies, an Extension

TABLE 2.5  
HOW OFFICIALS AND NON-OFFICIALS COMPARED IN THEIR VIEW OF COORDINATION IN  
AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMMES

	Officials	Non-officials	Difference
Mostly worked together well (Number answering question)	55% (337)	45% (210)	10
<i>Loans</i>			
Mostly worked together well (Number answering)	51% (63)	39% (51)	12
<i>Improved seed</i>			
Mostly worked together well (Number answering)	43% (231)	35% (147)	8
<i>Improved implements</i>			
Mostly worked together well (Number answering)	48% (31)	24% (25)	24
<i>Minor irrigation</i>			
Mostly worked together well (Number answering)	38% (355)	27% (209)	11
<i>Major/canal irrigation</i>			
Mostly worked together well (Number answering)	53% (19)	0% (19)	53

Officer, Panchayats said: "It is not the officials and non-officials operating the programme who are to be blamed, but it is the shortage of fertilizers which has made the programme unsuccessful to some extent." While a Block Development Officer remarked: "Indents for supply of super-phosphate were sent to Assistant Registrar of Cooperatives three months ago, but the supply is not made so far. I also sent seven reminders and discussed the same in the monthly meetings."

On the positive side a Block Development Officer recounted his experience thus: "The fertilizer is received at marketing society and further distributed among sub-depots at village level. When general shortage has occurred, there is a set procedure that the stocks received at the Marketing Society are sub-divided for the blocks being served by the Marketing Society. The distribution among the blocks is made by the SDO Civil in consultation with the concerned BDOs, keeping in view the quantities distributed last year. As for the distributions within the blocks, this is decided by the BDO in consultation with the concerned chairman of the Marketing Society.

An important factor in good coordination was the personal interest of officials and non-officials in the programme. As one District Planning Officer said:

"One month back there was an acute shortage of fertilizer in the district. The District Agricultural Officer was requested to approach the Director of Agriculture (state level) for prompt supply. The DAO acted promptly and got the needed things done within a week's time, and fertilizer was distributed to the various blocks. Whenever any problem has arisen, I have gone personally to the officer concerned to get the needful done, and this has helped to create a better understanding and promote the spirit of cooperation."

In improved seed programmes, strengths and weaknesses were both attributed more to the adequacy of inputs than to any other major factor. Nearly two-thirds blamed poor functioning or insufficient or late supplies or poor quality. Typical of this criticism are the following comments:

Extension Officer, Compost: "Due to late supply of seed by the district authorities, and due to the shortage of improved seed."

TABLE 2.6  
REASONS FOR VARIOUS AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMMES WORKING SMOOTHLY (ALL FUNCTIONARIES)

	Fertilizer	Improved seed	Loans	Minor Irrigation*	Major Irrigation**	Other†
<i>Adequate inputs</i>						
Adequate and timely supplies	23%	33%	4%	10%	—	18%
Timely irrigation	—	—	—	11	8	—
Other: funds, low cost, etc.	2	8	9	5	—	3
	25	41	13	26	8	21
<i>Institutional assets</i>						
Good communication and coordination	15	12	15	22	17	21
Adequate control and supervision	3	4	4	2	17	4
Other assets (planning stability, incentives, etc.)	5	4	7	4	8	0
	23	20	26	28	42	25

*Personal assets in officials*

High interest, motivation	20	17	24	19	8	21
Good leadership	2	3	2	4	17	2
Other (impartiality, ability etc.)	4	4	5	3	—	3
	26	24	31	26	25	26

*Personal assets in non-officials*

High interest by Panchayats	7	5	11	3	17	8
High interest by Cooperatives.	2	2	2	2	—	—
Other (non-interference, ability, etc.)	—	4	2	4	—	—
	9	11	15	9	17	8

*Other assets*

Progressive public	11	1	4	3	—	13
Miscellaneous (physical assets, climate, roads, etc.)	6	3	11	8	8	7
	17	4	15	11	8	20
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
(Number of reasons)	(284)	(136)	(46)	(195)	(12)	(61)

\* Including electricity. \*\* Including drainage.

† Including pesticides, improved implements, animals, soil conservation, etc.

TABLE 2.7  
REASONS FOR AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMMES WORKING POORLY (ALL FUNCTIONARIES)

	Fertilizer	Improved seed	Loans	Minor Irrigation*	Major Irrigation†	Other‡
<i>Inadequate inputs</i>						
Lack of delay in supplies	45%	41%	9%	18%	8%	27%
Wrong kind or quality	5	13	—	—	—	6
Inadequate irrigation	5	2	—	12	22	—
Inadequate electricity	—	1	2	11	—	1
Lack or delay in funds	—	1	12	6	3	1
Other drawbacks in inputs	4	7	2	1	3	4
	59	65	25	48	36	39
<i>Institutional defects</i>						
Poor communication/coordination	11	7	18	16	22	6
Other: lack of supervision, dual command, red tape, etc.	8	9	13	9	11	5
	19	16	31	25	33	11

*Personal drawbacks: Officials*

Lack of interest	7	3	7	7	8	8
Partisanship, dishonesty, corruption	4	4	4	7	6	7
Other: lack of ability, etc.	2	1	4	2	11	5
	13	8	15	16	25	20

*Personal drawbacks: non-officials*

Lack of interest	2	1	6	1	—	3
Other: dishonesty, factions, etc.	2	1	16	1	—	1
	4	2	22	2	—	4

*Other drawbacks*

Shortcomings in public	1	5	4	5	6	17
Miscellaneous	4	4	3	4	—	9
(Number of reasons)	100% (249)	100% (223)	100% (55)	100% (439)	100% (36)	100% (99)

\*Including electricity.

†Including drainage.

‡Including pesticides, improved implements, animal husbandry, soil conservation, etc.

Sarpanch, Village Panchayat: "Last year the maize seed was sent to us for sowing purposes. But in fact it was the worst type of seed."

On the positive side,

Block Development Officer: "We procure foundation seed from the Government Seed Farm every year well in advance of the sowing season. This is distributed in time to the Registered Growers for further distribution, and part of it is also retained to be sown in the Block Seed Farm. The seed multiplied is collected immediately after the harvest to be issued next year to the farmers. The funds to purchase the seed are also obtained on time from the District Agricultural Officer."

VLW: "It is due to the keen interest taken by the BDO in regard to implementation of this programme."

### *Minor Irrigation*

Shortcomings in minor irrigation were attributed to inadequate electricity in one out of ten reasons, and also on poor communication. On the positive side, credit for smooth functioning was given to good communication in one-quarter of the cases, and also to interest on the part of officials.

SDO, Civil: "The problem of credit is not very acute. The real problem is the supply of material and energy for operating the pumping sets. Two years ago one special electrification project was sanctioned by the Irrigation and Power Minister. The loanees have purchased pumping sets long back and fitted them to their wells. But until now the promised electrification has not come. The result is that the machines are lying idle undergoing depreciation without any work. The farmers are facing recovery proceedings for not paying back the loans."

Extension Officer, Compost: "The Electricity Department does not provide enough connections and whatever connections are provided have come very late."

Chairman, Block Samiti: "A cultivator got electric connection after four years, and that too when the Chairman of the Panchayat Samiti intervened."

On the positive side,

Block Development Officer : "There is proper understanding between the officials and non-officials at all the three levels. We receive the money for distribution as loans for minor irrigation purposes to the cultivators, and all the money was properly distributed within a period of two months. This was possible only because of the cooperation and coordination extended by all concerned departments."

District Planning Officer : "Because of a good administrator and coordinator at the district headquarters. A man applied for loan for the construction of tubewell (on a certain date) to the BDO; on that application the Tehsildar made his remarks and forwarded to the Agriculture Inspector after three days. The Agriculture Inspector verified it and forwarded to the District Planning Officer's office after seven days. This was received in the DPO's office one day later and was put up to the DC the following day. So within 15 days it has been processed and submitted for the sanction of loan."

The importance of personal interest, leadership and dedication in minor irrigation schemes was illustrated in statements such as:

SDO, Civil : "Due to the keen interest taken by the officials and cultivators. Particularly the SDO Electricity, BDOs, Tehsildars, and others are very much interested in the execution and implementation of this programme."

Extension Officer, Cooperatives : "It is also because of the good lead of the BDO of this place."

### *Loans*

Programmes for *loans* were said to break down partly from institutional defects such as lack of supervision, and also because of personal drawbacks in non-officials such as disinterest or dishonesty. Where loan programmes were successful, this was mainly attributed to personal assets in officials such as strong interest.

E. O. (Animal Husbandry) : "Loans are given only to those persons whose party is in power. Therefore, loans given to the cultivators are not being utilised properly."

BDO : "Loans are given only to those who have good relations with the Pradhan. The money is given to the rich people and it is used mostly for purposes other than agricultural purposes."

Chairman, Zila Parishad : "Because of group rivalry between various members within the Panchayat Samiti (block level)."

E.O. (Panchayats) : "Corruption in the Revenue Department. The Patwari while attesting the application for loan demands money."

### *Major irrigation*

Major irrigation programmes were mentioned by few persons as among the three most important in their area. Good functioning here was attributed mainly to institutional assets such as effective control and supervision. But breakdowns were also attributed to institutional defects such as poor communication, and partly to personal drawbacks of officials such as lack of ability.

BDO : "Because they (Officials of Canal Department) are not under Block Samiti. This is an independent department with the result that they do not care much."

Chairman, Panchayat Samiti : "Rules regarding provision of outlets from the canals are very strict and rigid. It takes a long time to acquire land for distribution channels."

SDO, Irrigation : "The main problem here is that of canal head clearance. This can be solved at the proper time if machines are made available by the concerned department and if disputes regarding water courses are settled early."

Member, Block Production Committee: "Lack of co-ordination between the irrigation and development departments."

On the positive side,

SDO, Irrigation : "There is appreciable administrative control over patwaris and the cultivators through Ziladars".

Tehsildar : "Because of the good supervision of the Revenue Department."

*Assistance to agriculture by various departments*

If various agricultural programmes were not seen as working satisfactorily by well over half the number of officials and non-officials, two issues immediately arise. In the first place, we have to find out to what extent different departments supposed to perform inter-related activities for achieving increased agricultural output share this ultimate goal? Secondly, assuming that departments do share the common objective of increased production, is this reflected in action? Here the question of coordination of activities between pairs of functionaries at various levels in the system is important. This aspect is taken up in a later chapter. The extent to which various departments' activities are of direct help to increased agricultural output, as seen by the respondents, is discussed here.

The interviewer started by saying:

"The departments in the districts and blocks carry on a variety of activities. Some activities are of direct help to agricultural output, such as fertilizers in the needed quantity, of the right type and at the right time. Some activities *ought* to help agricultural output but in fact do not, such as fertilizers of the wrong type or at the wrong time; seed of poor quality; canals or wells constructed, but without proper distribution channels; loans too late or misused, etc. And some activities are not intended to raise agricultural output, such as maintaining law and order". Then for each department in turn the interviewer asked:

"In your opinion, how far this department's activities (in your block/district) are of direct help to agricultural output?" The respondent chose one of five answers; almost all activities help directly, most help, about half, a few, or none help directly. In general, officials tended to be more favourable

TABLE 2.8  
EXTENT OF HELP TO AGRICULTURAL OUTPUT BY SEVERAL DEPARTMENTS\*

	All func- tionaries (N=650)	Officials in departments		Non- officials (N=249)	Difference: Column 2 Column 4
		Those departments	Other departments		
<i>Planning Department</i>					
All or most of activities help	54%	65%	55%	48%	17
Half to none help	39	32	38	43	
Not ans.; no idea**	7	3	7	9	
	100%	100%	100%	100%	
(Number of persons)		(101)	(300)		
<i>Cooperative Department</i>					
All or most help	42%	59%	42%	39%	20
Half to none help	49	34	48	52	
		(54)	(347)		
<i>Minor Irrigation</i>					
All or most help	41%	57%	48%	29%	28
Half to none help	50	38	43	61	
(Number of persons)		(21)	(380)		

*Major/Canal Irrigation*

All or most help	24%	33%	31%	12%	21
Half to none help	54	47	50	61	
(Number of persons)		(15)	(386)		

*Revenue Department*

All or most help	16%	51%	12%	9%	42
Half to none help	74	41	78	82	
(Number of persons)		(76)	(325)		

*Electricity Department*

All or most help	13%	†	17%	8%	12
Half to none help	72		72	73	
(Number of persons)		(5)	(296)		

\* For wording of question see text.

\*\* For simplicity the percentage not answered is omitted from the remaining items; it ranged from 9% to 27% (the last was for non-officials in regard to major irrigation).

† Too few cases to show data.

than non-officials. The response can be summed up as follows:

- (1) Planning Department (as we might expect) was considered contributing most among six departments which render help to agricultural output directly. A clear majority of officials and about half the non-officials thought all activities of this department helped. For all other departments, however, the percentage of unfavourable views outweighed the favourable.
- (2) Cooperative Department and Minor Irrigation earned fair scores; half of all respondents felt their activities helped only partly or little.
- (3) Poor scores were earned by Major Irrigation, Revenue Department, and Electricity Department, which were seen by only one-quarter or less of the total group to be of direct assistance to agriculture. These results support the previous sections' report of deficiencies in major irrigation and electricity programmes.
- (4) As might be expected, officials within a given department had the most favourable view of it; officials in other departments stood next; and non-officials were least favourable. Within these categories, however, the various departments tended to hold the same rank order.
- (5) There was one notable exception. Officials in the Revenue Department were more convinced than anyone else that their department assisted agricultural output. This view was not shared either by other officials or by non-officials. Non-officials disagreed with officials most sharply in the case of Revenue Department, and next in the case of Minor Irrigation.

#### *Extent of help to agriculture output by non-official bodies*

The study added a question about the help given to agricultural output by Panchayat and Cooperative bodies.

Panchayat Samitis were seen as helping agricultural output as much as Planning Departments. Non-officials were more favourable toward the Samitis, while officials were more favourable toward the departments. (This was to be expected.)

Opinion was split in regard to block Cooperative Societies, where somewhat less than half of both officials and non-officials felt that the societies generally helped agricultural output. In general the views toward Cooperative Societies were rather similar to the views toward Cooperative Departments.

### *Agricultural Production Committees*

The survey had questions concerning the Agricultural Production Committee which existed (officially) in each of the blocks and districts. How much did the functionaries know about it, and what was their judgment of its effectiveness?

Only half of the respondents—the figures were similar for both officials and non-officials—had any information about the Agricultural Production Committee in their block or district. Three functionaries in ten thought there was no committee or did not know if it existed; another two out of ten thought it existed but did not know who was on it. But this gap in knowledge about the Agricultural Production Committee was more acute among officials at village and Tehsil levels (68% to 75% saying no information) and among non-officials at village level (86% having no information). The remaining half included respondents who gave at least one correct fact about the committee, such as the number of members, or the correct designation or position of one or more members. This was confined to respondents at block and district levels only.

When those who believed that such a committee existed were questioned further about its effectiveness, one-quarter thought the committee had done “a good deal to reduce bottlenecks and delays”; while a majority both of officials and non-officials thought it had done only a fair amount or not very much.

The work of the Agricultural Production Committee or Co-ordination Committee was not widely known either among officials or non-officials particularly at lower levels. Only a minority thought that they had done a good deal to improve the working of agricultural programmes.

### *Suggestions for improving agricultural programmes*

Suggestions for improving the functioning of programmes

TABLE 2.9  
SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMMES\*

<i>Improvements in</i>	<i>Officials</i> (N=401)	<i>Non-officials</i> (N=249)	<i>Cultivators</i> (N=276)
<i>Supply of inputs</i>			
Adequate and timely supplies	69	52	28
Right kind or quality	10	14	3
Supplies at cheaper cost	10	9	5
			36%
Adequate irrigation (including government financing)	18	29	35
Better financing (subsidy, lower interest, loans in kind, etc.)	19	20	5
Adequate electricity	14	17	—
Better physical facilities	11	6	—
Adequate funds (to institutions)	8	5	—
Miscellaneous improvements	2	2	6
	<hr/> 161	<hr/> 154	<hr/> 82
<i>Institutional factors</i>			
Better technical guidance, contacts, information	19	19	4
Better supervision (inspection, recognition, checking, etc.)	9	8	2

Tighter control	8	7	—
Delegation, decentralized control	7	4	—
Better coordination between departments	6	4	—
Other (more staff, realistic targets, flexibility, define responsibility, etc.)	15	8	3
	64	50	9
<i>Non-official bodies</i>			
More power, etc., for Panchayats, Cooperatives; miscellaneous	8	7	—
<i>Personal factors</i>			
Officials (training, honesty)	1	3	3
Non-officials (training, honesty)	1	1	2
Motivate cultivators; other	3	4	4
	5	8	9
Total†	238%	219%	100 %

\*For each agricultural programme named by respondent, he was asked (Qs. 19—21): "What suggestions do you have for improving the way this programme operates?" Cultivators were asked: "You have talked of difficulties in getting fertilizer, seed, loans, etc. What suggestions do you have for improving these matters?" Percentages are based on numbers of respondents, and not (as in previous charts) on numbers of suggestions.

†Since each person could give several suggestions, percentages total to more than 100%.

are summarised in Table 2.9. Since the same suggestion was likely to be given for several programmes, the table does not separate suggestions according to type of programme. But it does show columns for officials, non-officials, and cultivators.

(1) Overwhelmingly, suggestions for improvements fell mainly in the area of more adequate inputs. Two-thirds of officials (69%) and half of non-officials (52%) wanted larger or more timely supplies. About one person in ten, both officials and non-officials, called for better quality of inputs, and a similar number wanted them at lower prices.

(2) Better supplies were also requested by cultivators, but the demand was smaller (36%) than in the case of functionaries. We saw earlier that many cultivators did not feel the need for using fertilizers, improved seeds, or other innovations.

(3) Adequate irrigation, next to adequate supplies, was the most important plea of non-officials (29%), and was still more important to cultivators (35%).

(4) About one suggestion in five concerned the *financing* of inputs. In this category were requests for irrigation subsidies, lower interest rates, loans in kind, etc.

(5) About one functionary in six (17% of non-officials, 14% of officials) requested more electricity. This was especially needed for irrigation.

(6) Among the improvements in *institutional* factors, about one functionary in five (19%) requested better technical guidance, more contact with experts, more communication, etc.

(7) Other institutional suggestions concerned better supervision or checking, tighter or more centralised control, or its opposite—delegation or decentralised control, etc.

### SUMMARY

Programmes of fertilizer distribution were among the most important, and improved seed programme was third in importance. However from one-third to one-quarter of cultivators who needed these could not get supplies, or got less than they needed, or late.

More serious deficiencies lay in minor irrigation, which everywhere was of high importance, but suffered from low or late supply to over two-thirds of cultivators.

Major canal irrigation and electricity were less important as programmes, but contained the most severe difficulties, affecting 19 cultivators out of 20.

The average use of fertilizer among our total sample was very low. The total sample used improved seed for one quarter of all these seed requirements. While improved varieties were often used for wheat, very few did so for other important crops like paddy (rice), barley, bajra, or gram.

Aside from fertilizer and seed, about half of the sample wanted or applied for a loan in the past two years, for agricultural purposes. However, only one-quarter of the sample received the loan. One in six wanted a loan but did not apply thinking they would not get it.

Among cultivators who wanted fertilizer and improved seed, two-thirds got these within one week. For cash loans, on the other hand, three farmers in ten waited one to two months or more.

Systems for supply of inputs varied in complexity, *i.e.*, in number of steps involved. For improved seed the system was simplest: close to half the farmers obtained this directly from a source. Fertilizer was next, requiring three steps or more for one-fifth of the cultivators. Loans were even more complex. Simplification of procedures for fertilizer and for loans might reduce delay.

### *Departments*

Among six departments listed, Planning Department was seen by both officials and non-officials to be of greatest direct help to agricultural output. Cooperative Department and Minor Irrigation received mixed responses. Half the officials felt their activities helped agriculture only partly or little.

Poor scores were earned by Major Irrigation, Revenue Department, and Electricity Department, which were seen by half

or more of both non-officials and officials outside these departments, as giving little assistance to agriculture.

Panchayat Samitis were seen as helping agricultural output about as much as Planning Department. Opinion was split about block level Cooperative Societies.

The work of Agriculture Production or Coordination Committees was little known, particularly among the block and village level functionaries.

### *Reasons and Suggestions*

Although the question was asked as to why various persons or departments worked together well or poorly in various agricultural programmes, the bulk of criticisms and suggestions did not concern coordination at all. Rather they concerned the matter of *supplies*—the quantity or timeliness of fertilizers, improved seed, and other inputs, and to some extent their quality.

Cultivators furthermore gave lack of irrigation as a major reason why they did not use fertilizer although they had wanted to. And shortages in minor irrigation in turn were blamed, in one out of ten reasons, on inadequate electricity.

Complexity of procedure (red tape) and other institutional defects were mentioned both by functionaries and cultivators as important obstacles in loan programmes.

One out of five, both among officials and non-officials, recommended some kind of improvement in the financing of inputs, such as subsidies, lower interest, etc.

One out of five functionaries said better technical information and guidance was needed.

### CHAPTER III

## COORDINATION

A striking feature of complex large scale organisation is the specialisation of organisational roles and division of labour leading to functional inter-dependence. Hence coordination of activities of the organisation is very essential if the organisational goals are to be achieved. Routinisation and mechanisation of procedure is functional in a bureaucracy but in a development programme like that of agriculture, it is likely to inhibit progress. Further, mechanistic approach for effecting coordination through a maze of rules and regulations, through programmed coordination, though useful to some extent, cannot solve all the problems.

In recent times, organisational studies are approached from the behavioural angle, that is, in terms of the efforts and interactions of individuals in a system. It has been found that effective coordination depends on the extent to which individuals in an organisation understand the common goals and share in the belief that these are capable of realisation if they make a conscious effort to articulate their activities. Conceived thus, their functioning has become interdependent both within and across the organisations. Adopting this approach to studying coordination of agricultural programmes, it will be seen that the many roles and activities involved are not independent of one another, but complementary. This interdependence of roles and functions makes the need for coordination imperative. As Talcot Parsons observes, "the various elements having differentiated roles in a system must be coordinated either negatively, in the sense of the avoidance of disruptive interference with one another, or positively, in the sense of contributing to the realisation of certain shared collective goals through collaborated activity."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> T. Parsons and E. A. Shils (eds.), *Toward a General Theory of Action*, Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University Press, 1952, p. 197.

The main theme of this chapter is to study coordination in terms of the inter-relations of pairs of functionaries at district, block, tehsil, and village levels. The major index of good coordination devised for the study, is the perceived promptness with which an individual/agency in the network is reported to fulfil requests for help in agricultural matters. In particular, definitive answers to the following questions were sought. Who are the individuals/non-official bodies in the network most frequently contacted by cultivators as well as by functionaries? How promptly do these individual agencies fulfil requests for help in matters regarding agriculture? At what level or between which pairs of functionaries is coordination reported to be good or poor?

As a frame of reference for analysing the data, we may recall the operational definition of coordination in a system, given in Chapter I. It implies a network of individuals performing a series of inter-related activities at the right time or in the right way for achieving the target.

#### *Persons or organisations contacted by cultivators*

The cultivator was asked about the use of fertilizers, improved seeds, etc. He was also asked what steps he went through to get these inputs—what persons or organisations he contacted for assistance.

The Village Level Worker was contacted by many more cultivators than was any other person or organisation (Table 3.1). From one-third to one-fifth also named the village Panchayat or its Sarpanch, a village level Cooperative Society, Patwari, and Block Development Officer.

When cultivators were asked how promptly these persons acted on a request, both the VLW and the Sarpanch were called prompt by a large majority (69%) of cultivators. Next stood the block level Extension Officer for Agriculture and the village Cooperative Society.

The Block Development Officer earned mixed reports, while the Patwari was mainly seen as late.

TABLE 3.1  
PERSONS OR ORGANISATIONS CONTACTED BY CULTIVATORS FOR FARMING SERVICES,  
AND PROMPTNESS OF THEIR ACTION

	Per cent mentioning (N=276)	Promptness of action*		Number mentioning
		Mostly on time	Partly; or often late	
<i>Officials</i>				
VLW (Village Level Worker)	60%	69%	25%	166
EO (Extension Officer) Agriculture	9	59	37	24
BDO (Block Development Officer)	20	44	43	53
Patwari/Lekhpal	25	43	50	70
<i>Non-officials</i>				
Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat	34%	69%	20%	95
Village Cooperative Society	36	62	32	98

\*Not shown is the small percentage with no opinion (ranging from 4—13%).

*Functionaries' reports of promptness*

Early in their interview, officials and non-officials were asked to list the persons or organisations at each level with whom they mainly dealt in carrying out agricultural programmes.

The respondent then picked up to *six* main contacts, spreading his choices among various categories. For each contact he described the kind of requests he might make, and how promptly that person or organisation generally acted on such a request. These results appear in Table 3.2.

The results are only partly consistent with the experiences of cultivators. These functionaries had frequent contacts at district, sub-division and block levels, which cultivators rarely had.

(1) Among officials, highest promptness was reported (with only one-quarter or fewer reporting "slow") for: sub-division officer for Revenue, District Collector, District Planning Officer, and Cooperative Supervisor (village level).

(2) A majority of functionaries said the BDO to be prompt, while the VLW was considered prompt by 54 per cent and not so by 40 per cent. Cultivators said the opposite; VLWs were outstanding in promptness, and BDO, only fair. It seems likely that VLWs were responsive to requests from the cultivators while BDOs were responsive to functionaries at block and district levels.

(3) Among non-officials, those who received good scores for promptness were Adhyaksha or Zila Parishad President, and the district Cooperative Bank. These persons were contacted by very few respondents.

(4) Much lower scores ("prompt" replies only slightly exceeding "slow") were assigned to: District Cooperative Societies, village Cooperatives, village Panchayat or its Sarpanch, and Cultivators and registered seed growers. Functionaries were less favourable toward the village non-officials than were the cultivators. Again it is likely that village non-officials were more responsive to requests from villagers than to requests from higher levels.

(5) In one respect both groups agreed: The Patwari was the least prompt relative to all the other functionaries. At the Tehsil level, likewise, the Tehsildar was seen as rather slow.

The technique used did not allow for getting a clear picture regarding coordination. It only indicated that the Revenue Department was the least responsive.

### *Coordination among positions*

In order to locate the level at which coordination is strong or weak, the survey used two techniques for obtaining the data. In the first method, several pairs of positions were listed (such as VLWs and BDO), and all functionaries were asked how well these individuals worked together in carrying out agricultural programmes. Data from this method are presented in Table 3.5. But this procedure had limited use in that many respondents had little contact with the particular positions named.

Hence another approach was used to supplement the data obtained through the first method. Each respondent was asked to name up to six persons or organisations whom he mainly contacted in carrying out agricultural programmes. He was instructed to select at least one contact (if possible) at each of several levels: village officials, block officials, district or sub-division officials, Panchayat institutions, Cooperative bodies, and any others—up to a total of six choices.

For each position or body named, the respondent was asked what kind of request (for some service or action) he might make of that person in regard to agricultural programmes, and how far the person “acts on your request *within the time that is needed*”—whether “mostly on time, sometimes on time, or often late”.<sup>1</sup> Also, after the respondent indicated what methods of communication were used with each person, he was asked whether the methods

<sup>1</sup> If the respondent said “often late”, he was then asked how much delay in terms of weeks was usual. In a preliminary draft of this question we tried to ask respondents how much time (in weeks) it generally took for the person to act on the request, but this proved too difficult for the typical respondent, and the answers “mostly on time”, etc., were adopted.

TABLE 3.2  
PERSONS OR ORGANISATIONS CONTACTED BY FUNCTIONARIES IN AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMMES, AND  
PROMPTNESS OF ACTION

	Per cent* mentioning (N=650)	Promptness of action†		Number Mentioning
		Mostly on time	Sometimes often late	
<i>District &amp; Sub-division officials</i>				
SDO Revenue	6%	68%	8%	38
Collector/District Magistrate/Deputy Commissioner	7	60	23	48
District Planning Officer	15	60	26	96
Assistant Registrar Cooperative Societies	15	63	31	96
District Agricultural Officer	31	55	37	202
Tehsildar	15	46	41	96
<i>Block &amp; Village Officials</i>				
Cooperative Supervisor	6%	69%	26%	39
BDO (Block Development Officer)	61	63	29	394
EO (Extension Officer) Agriculture	41	61	31	263
EO Cooperatives	13	54	36	84

VLW (Village Level Worker)	72	54	40	467
Patwari/Lekhpal	19	50	46	122

*District level non-officials*

Adhyaksha/President Zila Parishad	5%	74%	16%	31
District Cooperative Bank	5	68	13	31
District Cooperative Societies	5	50	35	34

*Block & Village non-officials*

Pradhan, Block Samiti	30%	54%	30%	195
Block Cooperatives	9	52	33	60
Sarpanch	60	49	41	391
Village Cooperatives	34	47	40	222

*Cultivators*

Cultivators	48%	51%	38%	312
Registered seed growers	8	52	44	52

\*In Q. 3 respondent was asked to list officials and non-officials at each level with whom he dealt in carrying out agricultural programmes. He was then asked in Q. 4 to pick up to six main contacts including one each among: village officials, district or sub-division officials, Panchayat institutions, and Cooperative Societies. These appear in the first column.

†Excluded are percentages not answering (mostly within 5—15%). Within each category positions are ranked by the difference between "on time" and "late".

"mostly worked well, sometimes well, or often poorly".<sup>2</sup> The results are shown in Tables 3.3 and 3.4.

*Coordination among officials in same line of command*

Within a single line of command, it is reasonable to expect that coordination will be better than among individuals not in one line. Ordinarily the District Planning Officer directs the BDO who in turn directs the VLW. The BDO also has some direct or indirect control over the Extension Officer for Agriculture who in turn supervises the VLW. Pairs of officials within the same line of command are given in Table 3.3, which shows how each official in the pair perceived the other.

The respondents were generous in their evaluation and consequently it may be best to consider replies of 70 per cent or higher as "good coordination" and responses of 80 per cent or higher can be called "good communication".

The second feature of Table 3.3 is that for three pairs out of four, the subordinate viewed his superior officer more favourably than the superior described his subordinate.<sup>3</sup> Possibly respondents in subordinate positions were being discreet.

Main features of Table 3.3 were as follows:

(1) Prompt action and effective communication were reported by Patwari when speaking of Tehsildar, and by VLW when speaking of BDO and EO Agriculture.

(2) The BDO praised the EO Agriculture for promptness and communication, and the latter tended to reciprocate.

(3) EO Cooperatives (block level) was only fairly satisfied concerning promptness and communication from Assistant Registrar

---

<sup>2</sup> That is, whether the methods worked well in "giving the needed information clearly, and on time". In what follows we shall speak of these two perceptions by each member of a pair as measuring "coordination" between them, although a purist might insist that promptness and good communication be reciprocal before one can speak of coordination.

<sup>3</sup> The exception was that of BDO and EO Agriculture—both at block level, where the relation was more that of colleagues than of superior-subordinate.

TABLE 3.3

COORDINATION AMONG OFFICIALS IN SAME LINE OF COMMAND AS REPORTED BY THOSE OFFICIALS

<i>Contacts between</i>	<i>Reported by</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Act on requests mostly on time</i>	<i>Communication: mostly works well</i>
Patwari and Tehsildar	Patwari Tehsildar	22 24	86%(+) 63	95%(+) 67 (—)
VLW and BDO	VLW BDO	26 26	77 (+) 61	100 (+) 81 (+)
EO/ADO Agriculture and BDO	EO Agric. BDO	19 25	68 72 (+)	79 96 (+)
VLW and EO Agriculture	VLW EO Agric.	20 26	75 (+) 42 (—)	80 (+) 61 (—)
EO Cooperatives and Assistant Registrar Cooperative Societies	EO Coop. AR Coop.	22 *	64 —	77 —

\* Too few cases to show data.

(+) Indicates a "good" response — that is, in the upper one-third of 30 such answers in Tables 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 3.6.

(—) Indicates a relatively "poor" response — in the lower one-third of such answers.

of Cooperative Societies (district level). Considering that subordinates generally praised their superior, this result indicates a weak link. (There were too few Assistant Registrars who mentioned EO Cooperatives to measure the reciprocal response.)

(4) BDO rated VLW only average in terms of promptness, although he considered communication with latter above average.

(5) The most critical response in this set was that of EO Agriculture toward VLW. Both promptness and communication from the latter were distinctly below average. However, it may be noted that this weakness was seen only by the superior.

#### *Officials not in the same line*

For officials not in the same line of command, coordination of their activities becomes much more difficult for the reason that the line of command is not clear. Data show that for officials not in the same line of command, coordination is more problematic than for officials in the same line of command. (Table 3.4).

(1) As seen by the BDO, relations between him and District Agricultural Officer were below average on promptness, and poor on communication.

(2) Relation of BDO and Assistant Registrar of Cooperative Societies was definitely poor on both aspects.

(3) Relations between District Agricultural Officer and District Planning Officer—essentially colleagues at the same level—were fair to good, as reported by the latter.

(4) At the village level, relations between VLW and Patwari were mixed. Each regarded the other as of average promptness, and VLW regarded communication with Patwari as poor.

#### *Coordination among officials, as reported by other functionaries*

In addition to the data shown above, several pairs of functionaries were listed, and *all* respondents were asked how well these pair of persons worked together in agricultural programmes. But they were not asked about any pair of which one member included themselves.

TABLE 3.4

COORDINATION AMONG OFFICIALS NOT IN SAME LINE OF COMMAND AS REPORTED BY THOSE OFFICIALS\*

<i>Contacts Between</i>	<i>Reported by</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Act on requests: mostly on time</i>	<i>Communica- tion: Mostly works well</i>
District Agricultural Officer & District Planning Officer	DAO	4†	—	—
	DPO	9	67%	89% (+)
BDO and District Agricultural Officer	BDO	18	55%	66% (—)
	DAO	†	—	—
VLW and Patwari	VLW	13	62%	38% (—)
	Patwari	17	59%	82% (+)
BDO and Assistant Registrar Cooperative Societies	BDO	†	—	—
	AR Coop.	5	20% (—)	60% (—)

\*Same construction as Table 3.3. ( + ) " Good " — upper one-third.

†Too few cases to show data. ( — ) " Poor " — Lower one-third.

TABLE 3.5

COORDINATION AMONG OFFICIALS, AS REPORTED BY OTHER OFFICIALS AND NON-OFFICIALS

	<i>Work together</i>		<i>Not ans., no contact *</i>	<i>Total (N=650)</i>
	<i>Mostly well</i>	<i>Partly; or often poorly</i>		
<i>Same line of command</i>				
VLW and BDO	68%	20%	12%	100%
EO Agriculture and BDO	62	18	20	100%
<i>Not in same line of command</i>				
District Planning Officer and District Agricultural Officer	44	11	45	100%
BDO and Assistant Registrar Co- operative Societies	32	24	44	100%
VLW and Patwari	18	64	18	100%

\* Also includes the few persons occupying these positions, who were not asked the question.

(1) Table 3.5 confirms the data in Table 3.3 from the functionaries themselves, of good coordination between VLW and BDO, and between EO Agriculture and BDO.

(2) Regarding three pairs of officials not in the same line of command, coordination was poorer than for those in the same line. Nevertheless, among these the best relations were between District Planning Officer and District Agricultural Officer—consistent with Table 3.4.

(3) Rather weak coordination was seen between BDO and Assistant Registrar of Cooperative Societies.

(4) Distinctly poor coordination was seen between VLW and Patwari. This differed from Table 3.4, where the two officials regarded each other as average in promptness. Perhaps the parties themselves, out of politeness or reticence, understated their conflicts. Possibly other observers overstated them. The truth perhaps lies in between. But even if we strike an average, the picture is hardly favourable. Relations between VLW and Patwari do not seem to be cordial.

#### *Coordination among officials and non-officials*

Table 3.6 next shows eight pairs of which the first is an official and the second a non-official, each speaking about the other.

(1) The BDO and the Pradhan reported that coordination between them was good. It was perhaps the best among the eight pairs examined.

(2) A favourable relation also existed between the District Agricultural Officer and non-official members of the District Agricultural Production Committee. Note that both of the above pairs occupied the *same level*—block and district respectively.

(3) The next two pairs also occupied the same level, namely, the village. VLW and Patwari reported about average promptness from the Sarpanch, while the Sarpanch was pleased with promptness of VLW and Patwari respectively. Thus in these first four pairs, officials and non-officials at the same level were able to work together.

TABLE 3.6

COORDINATION AMONG OFFICIALS AND NON-OFFICIALS AS REPORTED BY THESE PERSONS \*

<i>Contacts between</i>	<i>Reported by</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Act of requests: Mostly on time</i>	<i>Communication: Mostly works well</i>
BDO and Pradhan, Block Samiti	BDO Pradhan	8 20	88% (+) 70% (+)	88% (+) 75%
District Agricultural Officer & District Agriculture Production Committee	DAO Comm. ‡	† 14	— 83% (+)	— 75%
VLW and Sarpanch, Village Panchayat	VLW Sarpanch	22 15	64% 73% (+)	73% 87% (+)
Patwari & Sarpanch Village Panchayat	Patwari Sarpanch	22 11	55% 73% (+)	77% 64% (—)

District Agricultural Officer & Pradhan, Block Samiti	DAO Pradhan	† 14	— 50% (—)	— 64% (—)
VLW and Pradhan, Block Samiti	VLW Pradhan	† 25	— 52% (—)	— 60% (—)
BDO and Sarpanch, Village Panchayat	BDO Sarpanch	15 18	13% (—) 55%	20% (—) 72%
EO Cooperatives & Sarpanch Village Panchayat	EO Coop. Sarpanch	21 +	38% (—) —	48% (—) —

\*Same construction as Table 3.3. In each pair, official is shown first.

†Too few cases to show data.

‡Non-official members of District Agricultural Production Committee.

(+) "Good" — Upper one-third.

(—) "Poor" — Lower one-third.

(4) The remaining four pairs were all below average in promptness of action and communication, and in all cases they went *across* levels. Thus the Pradhan at block level criticised promptness of the District Agricultural Officer, and the Pradhan was also dissatisfied with the Village Level Worker's promptness and communication. These linkages need to be strengthened.

(5) Sharpest criticism was directed against the Sarpanch of the village Panchayat, to whom the BDO gave the lowest score of any both in promptness and communication. EO Cooperatives at the block level was also highly critical. On the other hand, the village Sarpanch gave average ratings to the BDO.

In short, while the village Sarpanch and corresponding officials at the same level seemed mutually helpful, dissatisfaction was expressed by block officials toward the village Sarpanch.

*Coordination among officials and non-officials, as reported by other functionaries*

The survey questionnaire also presented four pairs of officials and non-officials, and asked all functionaries (except members of a given pair) to rate the extent to which they worked well together (Table 3.7).

(1) Relative harmony was reported between BDO and Pradhan of Block Samiti, confirming the picture obtained from these functionaries themselves in Table 3.6..

(2) Many persons could not describe the next two pairs (non-answers were 43-47%). But favourable reports clearly outweighed unfavourable, regarding coordination between District Planning Officer and Adhyaksha of Zila Parishad.

(3) Some skepticism was expressed regarding the working together of EO Cooperatives (block level) and Chairman of Block Cooperative Marketing Society.

(4) The last pair is different, involving VLW and cultivators. A majority of functionaries thought the relation between them was somewhat more poor than good. The views of these parties themselves are examined next.

TABLE 3.7  
COORDINATION AMONG OFFICIALS, NON-OFFICIALS AND CULTIVATORS AS REPORTED  
BY OTHER FUNCTIONARIES\*

	<i>Work together</i>		<i>Not answered; no contact</i>	<i>Total (N=650)</i>
	<i>Mostly well</i>	<i>Partly; or often poorly</i>		
BDO and Pradhan, Block Samiti	53%	29%	18%	100%
District Planning Officer and Adhyak- sha, Zila Parishad†	36	17	47	100%
EO Cooperatives and Chairman, Block Cooperative Marketing Society	31	26	43	100%
VLW and cultivators	43	54	3	100%

\*Same construction as Table 3.5. Replies of officials and non-officials were found to be closely similar (within 1-7 percentage points).

†President, District Council.

*Coordination between officials and cultivators, as reported by them*

In interviews with cultivators, after being asked what persons they dealt with in order to get farming supplies or services, they were also asked: "When you request some service or action from (this person), does he act on your request *on time*, or *late*?"

Data show that VLWs and Patwaris were mildly dissatisfied with promptness of cultivators. For their part, the cultivators criticised the lack of promptness of Patwari. The VLW was considered by 70 per cent as prompt in his dealings.

## SUMMARY

This chapter continues the study of *where* coordination was good or poor by taking specific officials or non-officials contacted by cultivators or by other functionaries, and seeing which of them were generally prompt or slow in acting on requests.

Both cultivators and functionaries agreed that the Patwari was the least prompt relative to all other designations, and the Tehsildar was also seen as rather slow. These data confirm the pilot study finding of much delay by Revenue Department.

In other respects cultivators and functionaries disagreed. The latter reported the BDO as clearly prompt, but they saw the VLW, Panchayat or Sarpanch, and village Cooperatives as only mediocre. Cultivators held the opposite view. It is likely that VLWs and village non-officials were mainly responding to cultivators' needs, while BDOs were mainly satisfying their block and district colleagues.

With the technique of naming individuals, no clear differences emerged in the promptness of whole departments, other than Revenue.

Coordination between pairs of functionaries was measured by two methods. In the principal one, each official and non-official listed the *six main persons/organisations he contacted in agricultural programmes*, and rated the promptness of communication with each person. These replies indicated coordination between pairs of functionaries in the eyes of the *pairs themselves*.

In the second method pairs of functionaries were presented to all respondents (except those in a given pair) and were asked to rate how well the pairs worked together in agricultural programmes. These replies indicated coordination between the pairs in the eyes of other functionaries. Findings from the two methods were generally consistent.

One effort to summarise these results visually is given in Chart 3.1.

### *Results for officials*

(1) Officials in the same line of command within Development Department (BDO—EO Agriculture—VLW) and within Revenue Department (Tehsildar—Patwari) were generally seen as coordinating well, particularly by the subordinate in each pair, and by other functionaries. However, BDO rated VLW only average in promptness, while EO Agriculture judged VLW below average.

(2) Within Cooperative Department, however, EO Cooperatives (block level) was only fairly satisfied with promptness and communication from Assistant Registrar of Cooperative Societies (district level).

(3) Coordination between officials not within the same line of command (DPO and BDO with District Agricultural Officer and Assistant Registrar of Cooperative Societies) was satisfactory at district level only. Between BDO and the latter two district officials it was mediocre to poor.

(4) Between VLW (Development) and Patwari (Revenue), coordination was mediocre in their own eyes, and poor in the eyes of other functionaries.

### *Officials and non-officials*

(5) Between officials and non-officials at the *same* level, coordination was mostly seen as good. The best was for BDO and Pradhan of block samiti, followed by District Agricultural Officer and members of District Agricultural Production Committee; District Planning Officer and Adhyaksha of Zila Parishad; VLW and Sarpanch of village Panchayat; Patwari and Sarpanch.



(6) Mediocre coordination, however, was reported by other functionaries regarding EO Cooperatives and Chairman, Block Cooperative Marketing Society.

(7) Coordination *across* levels was unsatisfactory, at least to the official member of each pair. The block Pradhan criticised District Agricultural Officer, as well as the VLW. Even sharper criticism was voiced by BDO and EO Cooperatives (block level) toward village Sarpanch (although Sarpanch rated BDO average).

### *Officials and cultivators*

(8) Both VLW and Patwari were mildly dissatisfied with promptness of cultivators. The cultivators praised the promptness of VLW, but were critical of the Patwari.

These findings indicate at what points in the system of agricultural administration the weakest *linkages among functionaries* needs to be strengthened. They appeared between officials who were in different departments *and* at different levels; between officials and non-officials across levels (though not within the same level); perhaps within the Cooperative Department and between this Department and Cooperative Societies; and clearly between village officials and Development and Revenue.

## CHAPTER IV

### INITIATIVE

In any organisation, it is a futile endeavour to anticipate all situations and attempt to provide guidelines for the personnel. There are situations when an individual has to use his discretion in taking a decision that cannot be postponed merely because of the absence of instructions or precedent. Initiative, thus means that a person (while observing rules), takes action when a job needs to be done without getting instructions from higher echelons of the bureaucracy.

The problem is not solved by saying that a functionary should take initiative in performing his work. To what extent the present system allows him to act on his own without waiting for instruction, when occasion demands? What factors encourage or hinder a person in taking initiative? What improvements can be made so that scope for initiative is enlarged at all levels?

To measure the scope for initiative, two fictional block development officers—one who always observes rules but does not act on his own in the absence of instructions from above even though he knows that the job needs to be done; a second one, who also observes rules and regulations but at the same time uses his discretion in taking a decision without waiting for instructions from his superiors were described. With respect to each of the six main contacts, the respondent was asked whether that person performed his job “more like the first BDO, or more like the second one, or halfway in between”.

#### *Initiative as reported by cultivators*

For cultivators a simpler question was devised. The interviewer said: “Some officials do only what the government tells them to do, and never look for more things to do. Other officials are looking all the time for more things to do; they try to solve

problems on their own, without waiting for the government to tell them." With respect to each of the persons who had been mentioned by the cultivator for farming assistance, the interviewer asked: "which way does (this person) do his job—does he do only what the government tells him, or does he look for more things to do, and tries to solve problems on his own?"

Cultivators' views of officials' initiative were at best mixed, according to Table 4.1. About as many thought that the VLW and Extension Officer for Agriculture showed high initiative. But these views were more favourable than for BDO, few cultivators thought their BDO showed initiative and a substantial number (40%) thought he did not. Their views regarding the Patwari were also poor; over half the cultivators felt that he was doing only what the government told him.

The Sarpanch of the Village Panchayat, on the other hand, earned a high score in initiative; over half the cultivators saw their Sarpanch as looking for more things to do. The Village Cooperative Society was considered as predominantly lacking in this aspect.

*Views of officials and non-officials about initiative of different functionaries*

The views of functionaries based on the question of the BDOs are presented in Table 4.2.

Data are shown only for those respondents who named one of these officials or non-officials among his six main contacts. Within the three categories shown, functionaries are listed in decreasing order of initiative.

- (1) Block and village non-officials were considered higher in initiative than block officials, instead of lower. A majority of functionaries who contacted the head of the Panchayat body at all three levels—Pradhan of the block Samiti, Adhyaksha of the Zila Parishad (district council), and Sarpanch of the village Panchayat—said that he looked for more things to do and did not simply

TABLE 4.1

INITIATIVE OF PERSONS/ORGANISATIONS CONTACTED BY CULTIVATORS FOR HELP IN FARMING MATTERS

	<i>Looks for more to do</i>	<i>Does what government tells</i>	<i>In between; or no idea</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>N*</i>
<i>Officials</i>					
VLW	36%	37%	27%	100%	166
EO Agriculture	29	25	46	100	24
BDO	13	40	47	100	53
Patwari	18	57	25	100	70
<i>Non-officials</i>					
Sarpanch, Village Panchayat	53	17	30	100	95
Village Cooperative Society	25	48	27	100	98

\*Respondents were cultivators who said they contacted this person or organisation.

follow instructions.<sup>1</sup> Cultivators agreed with this view of the Sarpanch.

- (2) In contrast to Panchayats, Cooperatives at all three levels were seen by functionaries as lacking in initiative, and to do "only the usual things in the usual way". This view was supported by cultivators in regard to village Co-operatives.

With respect to officials,

- (3) Functionaries ranked BDO, EO Agriculture, and VLW in that order—and this was exactly opposite to the ranking by cultivators. The VLW, perhaps, was striving mainly to assist the farmers; perhaps the BDO was trying mainly to assist his colleagues at block and district levels.
- (4) At the village level, Cooperative Supervisor and Patwari were viewed by a majority as doing only what the government told them without looking for ways of doing their job better. Cultivators supported this view of Patwari.
- (5) Officials looking after Cooperatives at district level (Assistant Registrar of Cooperative Societies) and at block level (EO Cooperatives) were ranked lowest at these levels.
- (6) Highest on the list was Collector (District Magistrate/Deputy Commissioner), followed by Sub-Division Officer (SDO) for Revenue, and District Planning Officer, second in command under Collector with responsibility for all development programmes in the district.

*How occupants of each positive viewed initiative of that position*

We have seen how the initiative of numerous officials and non-officials was viewed by other functionaries and by cultivators who contacted these persons. How did these replies compare with views of the individuals occupying the same positions?

---

<sup>1</sup>Admittedly the story of the two BDOs does not apply exactly to a non-official. Therefore the interviewer added : "A Panchayat body or Co-operative Society, of course, does not have as many rules to follow as a government official. Nevertheless it can resemble these BDOs. A Panchayat/Cooperative is like the first man if it does only the usual things and waits for instructions before acting on problems. A Panchayat Cooperative is like the second man if it is always looking for new and better way for doing its work, and uses its own discretion."

TABLE 4.2  
INITIATIVE OF PERSONS/ORGANISATIONS CONTACTED BY FUNCTIONARIES  
IN AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMMES

	<i>Takes initiative</i>	<i>Does not take</i>	<i>In between; or no idea</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>N*</i>
<i>District and sub-division officials</i>					
Collector/District Magistrate	67%	17%	16%	100%	48
SDO Revenue	55	21	24	100	38
District Planning Officer	51	25	24	100	96
District Agricultural Officer	43	31	26	100	202
Tehsildar	41	38	21	100	96
Assistant Registrar Cooperative Societies	42	40	18	100	96
<i>Block &amp; village panchayats</i>					
BDO	49	30	21	100	394
EO Agriculture	47	31	22	100	263

VLW	37	42	21	100	467
EO Cooperatives	36	46	18	100	84
Cooperative Supervisor	33	59	8	100	39
Patwari	20	57	25	100	122
<i>Non-officials</i>					
Pradhan, Block Samiti	57	16	27	100	195
Adhyaksha/President, Zila Parishad	55	22	23	100	31
Sarpanch, Village Panchayat	54	22	24	100	391
Village Cooperatives†	37	41	22	100	222
District Cooperative Bank†	35	45	20	100	31
Block Cooperatives	32	43	25	100	60
District Cooperative Federation†	30	47	23	100	34

\*Number of functionaries who contacted each person/organisation.

†Including specific office-bearers.

Near the end of the interview we asked: "One of the things we are asking about is initiative. By this we mean some action which a person takes without being instructed, in order to get something done. How much scope is there for a person in your position to take initiative? Would you say the scope is good, fair, or poor?" While an individual is not likely to admit that his own behaviour is bureaucratic, he might freely assert that his job offers little scope for initiative.

A second question asked the respondent to consider other persons "in positions like your own in your block/district" (e.g., when interviewing a VLW, "other VLWs in your block".) "In general, would you say that they perform their job more like the first BDO (same question used in Table 4.2), more like the second man or halfway in between?" While a person might not like to admit that he himself lacks initiative, it is easy for him to ascribe such behaviour to his counterparts in the same job.

Without exception, all functionaries said their counterparts were more likely to take initiative than not. The various positions have also been rank-ordered on "potential initiative" (or scope). It is interesting to compare the two rank orders. In which positions did the occupants feel that the actual initiative was relatively better or worse than the potential?

(1) Some positions gave about the same rankings on potential initiative as on actual. The District Agricultural Officer, for example, stood first on both. Adhyaksha of Zila Parishad stood high on both. Pradhans of block Samitis and Sarpanchs of village Panchayats rated themselves slightly below average on both.

(2) Other functionaries rated their positions at the bottom on one or both listings: Tehsildar, Patwari, and President of the village Cooperative.

(3) For three positions actual initiative was ranked substantially lower than potential: Collector (District Magistrate), Assistant Registrar of Cooperative Societies, and Extension Officer for Agriculture. One can imagine why the Collector's performance falls below his potential. Theoretically he is the supreme authority in the district, and yet his job in recent years has become so complex with responsibility for development added to

traditional duties of justice, police, and revenue. The question that comes up is whether these additional duties have restricted the initiative of the Collector.

The potential for initiative indicated by Assistant Registrar of Cooperative Societies is 'moderate', whereas the actual initiative is rated low. How to explain this difference? Is it due to personnel, social environment (pressures) or the system of management?

Another way to study these data is to compare the last two tables. How did occupants of these positions rate initiative of counterparts (right half of Table 4.3), compared with judgments by other functionaries about them (Table 4.2)? For many positions the rank orders were similar. Here were some exceptions:

(4) Two positions were ranked higher by other functionaries than by occupants. Collector was ranked first in initiative by other functionaries, but only fifth by collectors themselves. In the eyes of others who deal with him, the Collector/District Magistrate does have freedom to innovate. He sees himself, though, more captive than the master of his job.

The other comparable position was Pradhan of block Samiti. Others ranked him first in initiative among non-officials while these men placed themselves next to last.

(5) Two other officials judged initiative of their counterparts higher than did other functionaries: District Agricultural Officer, and VLW. Perhaps these men in fact were innovating in their day-to-day activities, more than those who dealt with them could appreciate.

#### *Reasons for good or poor scope*

When asked about the factors which promote or hinder initiative, respondents gave a number of reasons. The comments may be divided roughly as "institutional" factors, concerning administrative arrangements and procedures, and "personal" factors, concerning abilities and interests of the office-bearers.

In general, seven functionaries out of ten—both officials and non-officials, blamed the system in which they operate, for poor

TABLE 4.3  
POTENTIAL VERSUS ACTUAL INITIATIVE AS REPORTED BY OCCUPANTS OF EACH POSITION

	N	Potential: Scope*			Actual: Counterparts†		
		Good Scope	Poor Scope	Rank	Take initiative	Do not	Rank
<i>District and sub-division officials</i>							
District Agricultural Officer	10	90%	10%	1	70%	20%	1
Collector/District Magistrate	9	75	12	2	37	38	5
Assistant Registrar Cooperative Societies	8	62	0	3	25	38	6
District Planning Officer	9	44	11	4	34	11	3
SDO (Revenue)	18	56	33	5	46	11	2
Tehsildar	26	38	16	6	46	31	4
<i>Block &amp; village officials</i>							
EO Agriculture	27	56%	18%	1	48%	26%	3
BDO	26	46	23	2	50	27	2

VLW	24	25	21	3	63	16	1
EO Cooperatives	27	33	37	4	36	18	4
Patwari	24	12	25	5	42	27	5
<i>Non-officials</i>							
Adhyaksha, Zila Parishad	9	67%	22%	1	55%	0%	2
Block Agricultural Production Committee	32	47	9	2	59	13	3
District Agricultural Production Committee	19	53	21	3	69	5	1
Pradhan, Block Samiti	26	50	19	4	58	15	5
Sarpanch, Village Panchayat	25	40	12	5	56	12	4
President, Village Cooperatives	19	16	10	6	52	21	6

\*Q. 22: "How much scope is there for a person in your position to take initiative good, fair, or poor?" Functionaries are listed in rank order of the *difference* between "good" and "poor" responses. Percentages for "fair" or "no idea" are omitted.

†After respondent was asked about initiative of his six main contacts (Q. 14, Table 7.2), he was asked: consider other persons in positions like your own in your block/district? How do they perform their job—more like the first man, more like the second man, or halfway in between?" Functionaries are ranked in order of the difference between the two responses. Percentages for "in between" or "no idea" are omitted.

initiative rather than personal drawbacks in the personnel operating that system. On the other hand, when they spoke of the reasons for good scope, they gave more of the credit to personal assets. Even so, about half (48%), of the officials still felt that the system was flexible enough to allow them to take initiative. A majority of non-officials attributed good initiative to personal qualities of the non-officials.

The major reason for lack of initiative was red-tape or rigid rules and procedures (28% of officials', 15% of non-officials'). A few typical verbatim responses illustrate this:

Thus a BDO noted:

"The work has become so stereotyped and tied with procedures and rules that any initiative taken is treated as going out of one's jurisdiction and undesirable. Many men's ideas that could be helpful in agricultural programmes could not be translated into action on account of fear of disciplinary action."

While an Assistant Registrar of Cooperative Societies remarks:

"The rules and regulations are such that we cannot take initiative."

The next question was concerned with centralisation *versus* delegation of power. Another reason mentioned both by officials and non-officials, attributed poor scope for taking initiative to over-centralization. A chairman of Block Samiti said:

"Because we are under government control and cannot take any action without prior sanction of the government."

A tehsildar remarked:

"One cannot take initiative as no direct powers have been given to us."

There was also the complaint of unsympathetic attitude of superiors toward initiative taken by their subordinates.

A similar number (5% to 10%) felt that adequate powers had been delegated and superiors encouraged them to take initiative.

High interest of officials in the job they were doing was

mentioned most frequently (18%) by officials as the reason for good scope for initiative. Similarly, when non-officials were talking, they gave high interest by non-officials in their work as the main reason (29%). In many cases the respondent was speaking about his own motivation. Some excerpts from the interview reports sum up the main thoughts expressed by the many. A BDO remarked:

"We have a vast field to work in, and unless initiative is there, the routine dealing of the problem will not bring any result of lasting value."

A Vice-President of a Cooperative Bank said:

"We take initiative when we think that the government has not issued any orders and the cultivators are suffering due to delay."

Lack of coordination between departments and poor communication between officials and non-officials were also mentioned by some as reasons for inhibiting initiative.

Speaking about the poor communication between officials and non-officials, a BDO noted:

"The BDO is a person controlled by two heads. Non-officials suppress him from their side and government officials instruct him to do something else. The poor fellow has to please both the sides and defend himself from the anger of both. Thus he has little scope to act according to his own will."

While a Adhyaksha of Zila Parishad remarked: "Officials do not cooperate with non-officials."

Some said that lack of clear instructions or technical training hindered initiative. Typical of this was the comment from a Member, District Agricultural Production Committee:

"We are not properly guided by the government officials, the result of this is that we lose interest in taking initiative. We do not know what we should do, because we are not acquainted with improved agricultural practices. We want to take initiative but we do not know about a particular programme and its procedure. We should be guided by the officials who are the experts and trained in community development programme."

Some said that conservative attitude of the farmers was an obstacle to initiative, some others felt that this vary factor made it more necessary to take initiative.

*Suggestions for improving initiative*

The large majority of suggestions concerned the improvement of institutional arrangements rather than personal factors.

The principal change desired by officials was greater decentralisation of powers (19% of their suggestions here). A related suggestion was the desire for simpler and more flexible procedures. Typical of this were the following comments:

Extension Officer, Panchayats: "More powers should be given to persons who have to implement the policies."

While a VLW forcefully noted: "The VLW should be given the freedom of improving the condition he finds, or choosing the way to solve a problem. The worker goes to the field, not the rule makers."

The principal suggestion among the non-officials was a parallel one—more power for Panchayat bodies (15% of their suggestions).

Among officials, the second most frequent suggestion was more adequate system for recognising achievement. If promotion was based only on seniority alone, initiative would suffer.

A District Animal Husbandry Officer said thus: "Sometimes we take initiative but the officials above us do not always appreciate this and we are not rewarded. Appreciation of work by non-officials, colleagues, and higher officials is necessary."

A District Planning Officer noted:

"Recognition should be given to workers. A rewarding system is essential for efficiency. Reward does not mean paying in cash, but if a person is doing good work, then at least he should be praised by the higher officials."

Another related suggestion was the sympathetic attitude by superiors. About one out of ten suggestions emphasised the attitude of higher officials.

Among the non-officials, the second most frequent suggestion was more adequate funds and supplies, followed by the desire for better communication between officials and non-officials.

Various other suggestions were offered concerning authority and powers of different departments. Thus, for example, a District Planning Officer said:

“The staff of the district including the BDO should be brought directly under me, and powers of regional officers should be curtailed.”

While District Agricultural Officer wanted that “the DAO should be given more powers. Extension officers for Agriculture should be brought under our direct control”.

Some persons stressed the need for better facilities and additional personnel and reduction of paper work.

#### SUMMARY

Initiative of various office-bearers was viewed from three perspectives: that of other functionaries who contacted them, that of cultivators, and that of the occupants themselves. These three perspectives usually coincided but sometimes did not.

(1) Cultivators ranked initiative of VLW, EO Agriculture and BDO from higher to lower in that order, while functionaries gave them exactly opposite ranks. It seems likely that the VLW was doing more to assist farmers than most functionaries realised, while the BDO was appreciated more by his colleagues at block and district levels.

(2) Heads of Panchayat bodies at district, block, and village levels were ranked rather high, in that order, by functionaries and by cultivators who contacted them.

(3) All agreed (including the occupants themselves) on the low ranking of Tehsildar and Patwari. These were said mainly to do “what the government told them”, rather than looking for better ways of doing their job.

(4) There was general agreement that district, block, and village officials for cooperatives were more bureaucratic than innovative in their approach.

(5) Cooperative societies at district, block, and village levels were seen by functionaries (and by cultivators, in reference to the village cooperatives) to be more passive than active in performing their job.

(6) District Agricultural Officer and VLW both ranked initiative of their counterparts higher than other functionaries ranked them. Perhaps these persons were innovating in ways that those who dealt with them could not appreciate.

(7) Lack of initiative was attributed mainly to defects in the institutional machinery rather than to shortcomings in the office-bearers themselves. High initiative, on the other hand, was attributed mainly to strong personal interest in the job to be done, and to other personal aspects.

The most often mentioned reason for low initiative was red-tape or rigid rules and procedures followed by insufficient delegation of powers and unsympathetic attitude of superiors toward initiative taken by their subordinates.

The principal recommendation by officials was greater delegation of powers and scope for discretion, while non-officials most often wanted more power for Panchayat bodies. A desire for simpler and more flexible procedures was also expressed often.

Another frequent suggestion by officials was a more adequate system of recognising achievement. If promotion was on the basis of seniority alone, initiative would suffer. Recognition could be given not only through material rewards, but also by appreciation on the part of superiors, of the work done and by responding to suggestions of the subordinates.

## CHAPTER V

### COMMUNICATION

At every point in the administrative process communication is a crucial variable affecting the success or failure in the execution of programmes. Communication pattern in relation to co-ordination and initiative in administering agriculture development was an important aspect of this study.

The importance of communication in any development programme need hardly be emphasised. It is obvious that numerous functionaries are involved at various levels in implementing the programmes. A fairly distinct demarcation exists between the decision-making levels and the field staff in any organisation. As the complexity of administrative process increases, these two categories of personnel do not participate in both these activities, thus leading to a gap in their knowledge. Unless this gap is bridged, the accomplishment of commonly shared objectives will be extremely difficult and in some cases even impossible. All these require adequate flow of communication from the higher to lower levels of the hierarchy both within and across the organisations and equally important "feed back" of information from lower to higher levels for realistic decision-making. Thus in the words of Floyd Mann, "the organisational function of communication is to transmit enough relevant information accurately and efficiently so as to reduce or prevent incompatibility, irrationality, and unwanted diversity in the behaviour and attitudes of those involved."<sup>1</sup>

Communication is crucial from another organisational standpoint. "It is also a powerful means for developing shared points of view among different people with strikingly diverse backgrounds, and for establishing shared or uniform standards of

---

<sup>1</sup> Basil S. Georgo Poulos and Floyd Mann : *The Community General Hospital*, New York: MacMillan, 1962, p. 500.

behaviour and, then, effecting conformity to them".<sup>2</sup>

Communication channels can be formalised mainly in the form of writing and well-defined superior-subordinate positions in any administrative network. But since members in the system frequently interact with one another informally, informal methods of communication also exist. Both these forms of communication will have to be taken into account in examining the effect of communication pattern on organisational efficiency.

The questions we posed for our study were: Within the administrative network, how frequently the functionaries at various levels contact one another? What methods of communications they most frequently employ? What communication pattern leads to greater promptness of action on the part of officials and non-officials? Secondly, what kind of communication pattern gives greater scope for initiative?

Apart from its crucial role in the organisational network for achieving the commonly shared objective, communication has another significant part to play. The decisions of the administration have to be communicated to its "clientele" (individual farmers). Communication is involved at every stage in the disposal of application for credit, fertilizers, and with propagation of research findings and so on. The promptness with which these are administered determines the end-product of administrative effort, namely, increased agricultural output.

Hence from the point of view of "clientele", the survey posed a few questions. How frequently the cultivators contact various functionaries for help in agricultural matters? How do they perceive the promptness and initiative of the functionaries contacted by them? Is there any relationship between the cultivators' frequency of contact and promptness of action and initiative on the part of officials and non-officials?

#### *Communication as reported by officials and non-officials*

The respondent was asked how often he communicated with each of his six main contacts, by any methods, regarding agricultural programmes. The following features of Table 5.1 may be pointed out.

---

<sup>2</sup>Basil S. Georgo Poulos and Floyd Mann, *op. cit.*, p. 503.

(1) Communication was least frequent with district level officials. Persons who named these said that the typical rate was monthly.

(2) The average frequency of communication with officials steadily increased from the district down to weekly contact with the VLW at the village level (the Patwari was an exception to the frequent rate at village level.)

(3) Among non-officials the pattern was similar but less sharp. At district and block levels communication occurred from once to twice a month, while the Village Sarpanch was contacted weekly.

(4) The largest number of persons (467) named a VLW as one of their contacts, and the next largest was the BDO. However one should remember that each district contained many VLWs and BDOs, and only one District Agricultural Officer. Hence the lower level positions were more likely to be named by someone. An "adjusted" number of contacts has, therefore, been given in the last column of Table 5.1. The actual numbers were multiplied by a constant such that the average of adjusted numbers at each level would equal 100.

(5) Relative to other officials at the same level (adjusted number), VLW still was named by the most people, District Agricultural Officer was second, BDO third, and Tehsildar fourth. Fewest persons (in adjusted numbers) named Cooperative Supervisor or Extension Officer for Cooperatives.

(6) Among non-officials, the actual number of contacts increased steadily from an average of 32 at district level to almost ten times that at village level. In relative terms (adjusted numbers), however, block Pradhan was named most often.

#### *Methods of Communication reported by functionaries*

The interviewer listed five ways in which two persons can communicate with each other:

- (i) Writing, such as letters or circulars;
- (ii) Personal talks between two individuals, inspection visits, etc;

TABLE 5.1  
FREQUENCY AND NUMBER OF CONTACTS WITH FUNCTIONARIES AS REPORTED  
BY OFFICIALS AND NON-OFFICIALS\*

<i>Contacts with</i>	<i>Daily, weekly</i>	<i>Monthly or less</i>	<i>Median Frequency</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Adjusted</i>
<i>District officials</i>					
District Planning Officer	29%	59%	Monthly	96	87
Collector	21	63	Monthly	48	43
District Magistrate Agricultural Research Cooperative Society	21	64	Monthly	96	87
District Agricultural Officer	15	61	Monthly	202	183
Average	22%	62%		111	100
<i>Sub-division officials</i>					
SDO Revenue	43%	36%	Fortnightly	38	57
Tehsildar	15	67	Monthly	96	143
Average	29%	52%		67	100

*Block level officials*

EO Agriculture	48%	Weekly	263	107
BDO	44	Fortnightly	394	159
EO Cooperatives	42	Fortnightly	84	34
Average	45%		247	100

*Village level officials*

VLW	49%	Weekly	467	223
Cooperative Supervisor	46	Weekly	39	19
Patwari	29	Tri-weekly	122	58
Average	41%		209	100

\*With regard to each person/organisation contacted to carry out agricultural programmes, respondents were asked (Q. 6): "In general, how often do you and (this person) communicate in regard to these programmes by any method—writing personal talks, meetings, etc.?" Choices were: Daily/Weekly/Fortnightly/Monthly/Quarterly/Yearly/Less often. Omitted above are responses for fortnightly, plus a few (0–6%) "no idea".

†See text. Actual numbers were multiplied by a constant such that the average of numbers in each category would equal 100.

(Continued)

TABLE 5.1—(Contd.)  
 FREQUENCY AND NUMBER OF CONTACTS WITH FUNCTIONARIES AS REPORTED  
 BY OFFICIALS AND NON-OFFICIALS\*

<i>Contacts with</i>	<i>Daily, weekly</i>	<i>Monthly or less</i>	<i>Median Frequency</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Adjusted</i>
<i>District non-officials</i>					
Adhyaksha, Zila Parishad	29%	54%	Tri-weekly	31	97
District Cooperative Federation	33	61	Monthly	34	106
District Cooperative Bank	32	61	Monthly	31	97
Average	31%	59%		32	100
<i>Block non-officials</i>					
Pradhan, Block Samiti	38%	41%	Fortnightly	195	153
Block Cooperative Society	20	63	Monthly	60	47
Average	29%	52%		128	100

*Village non-officials*

Sarpanch, Village Panchayat	49%	34%	Weekly	391	128
Village Cooperative Society	29	51	Tri-weekly	222	72
Average	39%	43%		307	100

\*With regard to each person/organization contacted to carry out agricultural programmes, respondents were asked (Q. 6): "In general, how often do you and (this person) communicate in regard to these programmes by any method—writing personal talks, meetings, etc.?" Choices were: Daily/Weekly/Fortnightly/Monthly/Quarterly/Yearly/Less often. Omitted above are responses for fortnightly, plus a few (0—6%) "no idea".

<sup>2</sup>See Text. Actual numbers were multiplied by a constant such that the average of numbers in each category would equal 100.

TABLE 5.2  
COMMUNICATION METHODS REPORTED BY FUNCTIONARIES IN CONTACTING  
OFFICIALS AND NON-OFFICIALS AT THREE LEVELS<sup>1</sup>

<i>Average for Contacts with</i>	<i>No. of positions</i>	<i>I Impersonal methods only<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>II Writing personal methods<sup>3</sup></i>	<i>III Formal meetings &amp; personal<sup>4</sup></i>	<i>IV Personal Methods only<sup>5</sup></i>
<i>Officials at</i>					
District level	4	32%	42%	18%	8%
Sub-division level	2	26	49	11	14
Block level	3	9	49	32	17
Village level	3	13	31	30	26
<i>Non-officials at</i>					
District level	3	19%	31%	20%	29%
Block level	2	14	33	31	21
Village level	2	1	26	32	35

<sup>1</sup> Five methods of communication were given: writing (letters, circulars, etc.) ; personal talks (between two persons, visits) ; formal meetings (regularly scheduled, with minutes) ; informal meetings (irregular, no minutes) ; other methods (telephone, messengers). Above table is based on the combination of two main methods reported by each functionary with each of his six contacts. The table shows the average percentage who used various methods in contacting four district level officials, two sub-division officials, etc.,—the same positions as in Table 5.1. Percentages across add to 100 per cent except for occasional "no idea".

<sup>2</sup> Writing plus formal meetings ; or either of these alone, or with "other".

<sup>3</sup> Writing plus personal talks or informal meetings.

<sup>4</sup> Formal meetings plus personal talks or informal meetings.

<sup>5</sup> Personal talks plus informal meetings ; or either of these alone, or with "other".

- (iii) Formal meetings that are regularly scheduled, with minutes kept;
- (iv) Informal meetings that are not regular, no minutes kept;
- (v) Other methods, such as telephone, verbal message through third party, etc.

The respondent was asked to rank these methods according to frequency of use.

#### *Four Communication Patterns*

For our analysis, four communication patterns were distinguished.

Functionaries using Pattern I relied on both writing and large formal meetings but few personal contacts. In Pattern II, writing and personal contacts predominated but not the meetings. Pattern III relied heavily on meetings and face to face personal contacts or informal meetings—but not writing. Pattern IV consisted only of personal contacts and or informal meetings.

From Table 5.2, it can be seen:

(1) In every category except village level non-officials, the combination most often used was Pattern II—writing combined with personal contacts.

(2) District and sub-division officials next most often used Pattern I—writing and large meetings.

(3) For block and village officials, the second most common pattern was III—formal meetings and personal contacts. This was also second for block level non-officials.

(4) For both district and village non-officials Pattern IV was also common; (personal talks or informal meetings exclusively).

(5) Moving from district to village level, it can generally be observed that there is a decreasing use of impersonal Pattern I, and an increasing use of Patterns III and IV—meetings and personal contacts.

*Effectiveness of communication patterns*

Which methods were most effective in promoting coordination and initiative? One way of answering this is to note how the respondents rated the promptness and initiative of each functionary they mentioned, and to see whether any parallel between these qualities and the methods of communication emerges. In other words, the question boils down to this: Is there some correspondence between the pattern of communication with a given functionary, and his scores on promptness or initiative? A measure of such correspondence is expressed in the form of Spearman's rank difference correlation.

Rank difference correlations were computed for each of the four communication patterns in relation to promptness, initiative, and frequency of communication (Table 5.3). The following trends may be observed:

*Pattern III — Meetings and personal contacts*

(1) In all three categories, use of Pattern III was positively associated with initiative.

(2) For officials at district level, Pattern I was mildly associated with promptness. But in the case of block and village officials, Pattern III was associated with promptness.

(3) Among non-officials, Pattern III was mildly associated with promptness as well as initiative.

*Pattern I — Impersonal methods of writing and large meetings*

(4) This pattern was associated with promptness for district & sub-division level officials.

(5) Among block and village officials, and among non-officials, the impersonal methods of Pattern I seemed to hinder initiative (negative correlation which is statistically significant also.)

*Other Patterns*

(6) Pattern II — writing and personal contacts—was largely neutral.

(7) An interesting result appeared for Pattern IV — use of personal or informal contacts only. Among block and village officials, use of this method accompanied low promptness, while

TABLE 5.3  
RELATION BETWEEN COMMUNICATION PATTERN, CORRELATION, INITIATIVE AND  
FREQUENCY OF CONTACT\*

	Frequency with Communication Pattern				Promptness with Communication Pattern				Initiative with Communication Pattern			
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
District & sub-divisional officials	-.07	.29	.20	.06	.33	-.03	-.04	-.11	.07	-.08	.8	-.44
Block and village officials	-.54	-.64	1.00	.03	.24	-.06	.39	-.50	-.60	.21	.49	.28
Non officials (levels)	-.69	-.29	.79	-.01	-.42	-.09	.40	-.21	-.57	.24	.38	-.39

\*Correlations are based on an N of 6 in the case of (a) District & Sub-division officials level and (b) block and village level officials in the case of non-officials, N is 7.

among the district officials, it was negatively associated with initiative.

(8) With regard to frequency of communication it may be seen that in all three categories, those who had used Pattern III communicated often while among those who used Patterns I and II communicated seldom. Frequent communication then is a favourable sign, since it generally accompanied that combination (Pattern III of meetings plus personal contacts) which encouraged initiative.

### *Cultivators' contacts with functionaries*

Let us now turn to a different set of data. For each agricultural input cultivators were asked what steps they went through to get the input, what persons they contacted, etc. Later they were reminded of these steps, and asked about any other persons or organisations they contacted "to get the supplies or service you need for farming".

Cultivators were then asked: "you might contact these people in various ways—such as personal visits, meetings, letters or written application, etc. We would like to know how often you generally contact these persons by any of these methods."

The answers in Table 5.4 show that among six functionaries commonly mentioned, the Sarpanch of the Village Panchayat was contacted most often by cultivators, followed closely by the Village Level Workers; the Block Development Officer was seen least frequently (a few times a year, on the average).

The table also shows in the right hand column the number of persons naming each functionary. The VLW was named by most farmers.

In order to determine the effectiveness of these amounts of communication, the middle part of Table 5.4 shows how the six functionaries ranked on cultivators' rating of them for promptness and initiative respectively (data previously shown in Chapters III and IV). Rank-difference correlations were computed, to indicate the general correspondence between these rank orders.

These correlations (bottom of Table 5.4) suggest the following:

(1) The more often cultivators contacted a given functionary, the more promptly that person was said to handle the cultivators' requests. The chief exception was Patwari—third in frequency, but sixth in promptness.

(2) The more often cultivators contacted a given functionary, the more he was said to "look for more things to do, without waiting for the government to tell him" (initiative). Exceptions again were for the Patwari and the BDO (low initiative) and for EO Agriculture, who showed *more* initiative than the frequency of contact would indicate.

(3) The greater the number of cultivators who contacted a given functionary, the more promptly (in general) he was said to act. The number of contacts was also mildly associated with initiative.

(4) Promptness and initiative, in the eyes of the cultivators, were themselves highly correlated. If a given person handled a request on time, he was also said to look for more things to do on his own.<sup>1</sup>

*Functionaries views on amount of communication, promptness and initiative*

(a) Earlier the data from functionaries on frequency of communication with various officials and non-officials, and their promptness as well as initiative have been presented. Do these measures on the amount of communication have any connection with promptness and initiative of the office-bearers? Rank-difference correlations among these factors are presented in Table 5.5.

(b) Frequent contact also meant more prompt action among officials at all levels but not among non-officials where the

---

<sup>1</sup> In interpreting these results we must be aware of "halo effects"—the tendency to regard another person as consistently good or poor on general qualities. Perhaps the correlation between promptness and initiative results from a tendency to like or dislike a particular functionary. A halo effect is not likely, however, to generate a relationship between frequency and promptness; contacting a person often does not imply that he is doing a good job. Also the number of persons contacting him carries no such implication.

TABLE 5.4

CULTIVATORS' REPORTS ON FREQUENCY OF CONTACTING FUNCTIONARIES AND THEIR PROMPTNESS AND INITIATIVE<sup>1</sup>

<i>Contacts with</i>	<i>Daily, weekly</i>	<i>Monthly or less</i>	<i>Median frequency</i>	<i>Number contacting</i>
Sarpanch of Village Panchayat	61%	17%	Weekly	95
VLW	52	27	Weekly	166
Patwari	30	53	Fortnightly	70
Village Cooperative Societies	21	65	Few/Yr.	98
EO Agriculture	17	75	Few/Yr.	24
BDO	9	74	Few/Yr.	53
Cultivators' ranking on				
	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Promptness<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>Initiative<sup>3</sup></i>
Sarpanch, Village Panchayat	1	3	1.5	1
VLW	2	1	1.5	2

Patwari	3	4	6	5
Village Cooperative Societies	4	2	3	4
EO Agriculture	5	6	4	3
BDO	6	5	5	6

## Rank difference correlations (rho)

	<i>Number</i>	<i>Promptness</i>	<i>Initiative</i>
Frequency and:	.66	.64	.87
Number and:		.67	.43
Promptness and:			.87

<sup>1</sup> See text for the question on frequency of contact, various alternatives were given : every day, every month, few times a year, etc. For simplicity the table omits "fortnightly" and "no idea". Number of respondents=276.

<sup>2</sup> Derived from Table 5.1.

<sup>3</sup> Derived from Table 4.1.

TABLE 5.5

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FREQUENCY OF AND NUMBER OF  
CONTACTS, PROMPTNESS AND INITIATIVE

	<i>Functionaries' contacts with</i>			
	<i>Dist. &amp; SD</i>	<i>Blk. and Vill.</i>	<i>Non. Offl.</i>	<i>Cultiva- tors</i>
Frequency & Number	-.61	.49	.90	.66
Frequency & Promptness	.85	.39	-.17	.64
Frequency & Initiative	.63	.49	.38	.87
Number & Promptness	-.57	-.14	-.39	.67
Number & Initiative	-.76	.66	.29	.47
Promptness & Initiative	.51	.41	-.14	.87

opposite tended to hold (we cannot be sure whether the latter result is meaningful).

(c) Among officials at all levels, those reported to be prompt were also said to show more initiative.

(d) Among lower officials and to a lesser extent among non-officials, those who were named by a greater number of other functionaries were also said to show more initiative. Sought-after persons were more likely to use their own judgment than were isolated ones. (The opposite was true at district level, where more isolated persons were more often said to act on their own judgment without waiting to be told.)

(e) Among officials and non-officials at all levels, the busier ones (sought by a large number) were somewhat less likely to act promptly. May be they were overloaded with requests and allowed less urgent matters to wait.

#### SUMMARY

Four communication patterns were identified and their effect on coordination and initiative examined with data on 19 types

of functionaries. Pattern III was positively associated with initiative. It was also positively correlated with promptness (coordination among block and village officials and also among non-officials at all levels).

For district level officials, however, coordination was better under Pattern I.

Reliance on Pattern IV—personal contact only—was not conducive to greater coordination.

Aside from particular methods, frequent communication was a favourable sign. At all levels, including cultivators' contacts, functionaries who were contacted often were more innovative and (with one exception) more prompt.

## CHAPTER VI

### CONCLUSIONS

The present study is an effort at understanding the problems in the administration of agricultural development. The study focuses attention particularly on the aspects of coordination, initiative and communication. This has been done as there is usually a criticism regarding these aspects in administration. Any research project has its limitation; so naturally our findings are restricted in scope. However, it is hoped that it has some relevant findings on which the administration may be able to act. It is also hoped that it does raise some further questions regarding the bureaucratic phenomenon in development administration to which further studies can be directed.

The previous five chapters have presented factual data on the way the officials, non-officials and cultivators viewed the administration of agricultural development programme. The present chapter is an attempt to briefly highlight the findings and indicate some possible approaches to meeting the problems that have been thrown up by the study.

#### *Agricultural Programmes*

The one greatest difficulty, according to cultivators and functionaries, that seems to hamper the successful working of agricultural programmes is the delayed and inadequate supplies of inputs. Only a small number of officials and non-officials explicitly referred to lack of coordination. The major suggestion for improvement related to timely and adequate supplies of inputs. This raises an interesting question. Functionaries seem to think that organisational problems like coordination will be automatically solved if only adequate supplies are made available in time. While an increase in supplies can overcome the overall shortage, it cannot, however, as our data have shown, tackle the organisational problem of coordination both within and across the levels.

There is, however, an implicit recognition of the important role of coordination when the functionaries felt that most of the activities of departments like the Revenue, Major Irrigation, and Electricity were not of direct help to agricultural output.

If the departments do not share a common goal, how to bring about complementarity in approach? The one solution that has been tried is the Committee approach to promoting coordination. Unfortunately, these committees at various levels seem to function in a routine manner. Participation in committees appears rather an exception than a rule. Basically, there is nothing wrong with this method. But its effectiveness depends very largely on the leadership and individual initiative. If both elements are absent, coordination suffers. We feel there is need for a depth study of the role of committees in promoting organisational coordination and in finding ways of increasing their effectiveness.

### *Coordination*

The central problem in coordination that emerges from the study is that Coordination between officials and non-officials across the levels as well as among officials not in the same line of command is reported to be poor. The question arises whether perfect coordination between the functionaries at various levels can be achieved. A categorical answer is not possible. Complete coordination in the mechanical sense is not possible of realisation in an organisational setting where it is now recognised that complex human relationships are involved. In the Indian context, there is the added difficulty of bringing together two entirely different kinds of people—officials and non-officials, whose background, attitudes, motivations and approach to everyday problems of administration are quite divergent. The official, on the one hand, is circumscribed by rules and regulations and tends to be bureaucratic in his functioning. On the other hand, a non-official who owes his position to popular vote may not idolise the rules and regulations and would like to act according to rule of the thumb. How can this contradictory approach to administration be reconciled? There can be no blanket solution. Each set of relationship calls for personality adjustment within the organisational setting.

By reducing the span of control, increasing the delegation of power and by strict and effective supervision, vertical coordination within the official hierarchy can be improved. But to achieve greater coordination between officials not in the same line of command and between officials and non-officials across the levels, no single solution applicable to all situations can be suggested. One possible direction in which efforts can prove successful emerges from the data on communication.

It has been observed that frequent contact between functionaries through large formal and informal meetings leads to greater promptness of action (used as a measure of coordination). More use of formal and informal meetings gives an opportunity for the people involved in the administrative network at various levels to understand better each other's problems. To that extent, the bureaucratic element in the official gets diluted, while the non-officials come to understand organisational discipline, thus contributing to a right perspective of the whole administrative process.

As indicated earlier the study has its limitations. This would also indicate the directions in which further studies need to be undertaken. While the attention was focussed on the problem of coordination within a district defined as a system, what has been studied applies more to a sub-system at the implementation level. As a basis for improving agricultural administration, the findings may have to be supplemented by a study of the problem in different areas and also at the policy making level, namely, state and national levels, to get a greater insight into this problem. It is our hunch that coordination at the policy making level is a prime requisite for effective implementation. This remains to be tested by empirical evidence. The totality of the administrative decision-making process has to be taken into account.

### *Initiative*

Data revealed that as high as 70 per cent of reasons for poor scope for initiative referred mainly to institutional defects, whereas personal assets in functionaries were the single largest factor in promoting initiative. While simplification of procedures and delegation of powers can go a long way in increasing the scope

for initiative, much remains to be done in the sphere of human relations. Confidence of the superior in the actions of subordinates is the most important factor in encouraging the latter to rise to unanticipated situations in their working. Here again, frequent contact between personnel in the network through the use of large formal and informal meetings can help them exercise discretion.

Traditional approach to management relies heavily on the assumptions that people are inherently lazy, avoid responsibility and they can be made to work only under fear of punishment or deprivation. By and large, this approach, known as Theory X management, has been found to be based on a wrong premise about human behaviour. In the industrialised countries of the West, rapid strides have been made in the direction of motivating the people in work situation in order to achieve organisational goals. This modern approach which has come to be known as Theory Y management is based, among other things, on the following assumptions about human behaviour: (i) "Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement"; (ii) The average human being learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept, but also to seek responsibility; (iii) the capacity for exercising a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity and creativity in solving organisational problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population."<sup>1</sup>

If these basic postulates are accepted, then the approach to motivating the public service personnel, whether in the field of agriculture or any other, calls for a revolutionary change. This again is an area where there is urgent need and great scope for empirical studies. Our study has pointed out that where there is mutual confidence between the superior and the subordinates, merit-based promotion and recognition of good work, people have taken initiative. We cannot add anything more than to suggest that the administrative leadership has to become dynamic and modern in outlook. Every act of administration particularly in the development sphere, is innovative in nature

<sup>1</sup>Arthur H. Keviloff. An Experiment in Management . . . in Robert T. Golembwiesce and others (eds.) *Public Administration : Readings in Institutions, Processes, Behaviour* : Chicago, Rand-McNally & Co. 1966, p. 281.

and unless there is a system for recognising the innovators, growth is stunted.

### *Communication*

Perhaps the most significant material with reference to agricultural administration emerged in Chapter V on communication. Four basic communication patterns, based on the two procedures most commonly used were distinguished.

*Pattern II.* It can safely be said that traditional administrative communication corresponds to Pattern II — emphasis on *writing* combined with *personal contacts*. The orthodox policy in bureaucracy has always been: “put it in writing”. This policy is amply observed in the administrative hierarchies surveyed. On any subject, thick files (literally tied in red tape) pass from office to office, from one level to another level, as a major medium of communication.

Under British tutelage, the impersonality of communication by file was softened with the human touch of person-to-person contact. The District Collector was literally a man on horseback, day-by-day touring the far reaches of his territory in order to listen personally to the complaints and disputes of its people, and render judgement.

Today the method of individual touring is urged for officials at district, block and village levels as a way of maintaining personal contact. (One often hears that the demands of excessive paperwork prevent the official from making the trips he is supposed to, and one suspects that the amount of touring in practice falls short of the ideal.)

It was noted earlier (Table 5.2) that this traditional combination of writing and personal contacts, Pattern II, was indeed the most commonly used in contacting officials at all levels and even in contacting non-officials at district and block levels. It was also seen in Chapter V that this common pattern was not particularly effective. It showed no positive correlation with either promptness or initiative of officials at district, subdivision, block or village levels who were contacted by functionaries. It showed a slight negative correlation with initiative of

non-officials contacted. This was true of the findings in the pilot study as well.

It is possible, then, that lack of proper coordination and initiative in agricultural programmes might be due to excessive reliance on this orthodox method of communication. Could coordination or initiative be improved by use of different procedures? Analysis of the other methods of communication might provide some leads.

*Pattern III.* Favourable results were obtained with communication Pattern III—meetings combined with personal contacts for promptness and initiative. The method of large meetings is a more recent device. An effective use of meetings, for example, was described in the pilot study interview (p. 26):

“There is good coordination in fertilizer distribution. There are 41 fertilizer sub-depots in the block and six Sub-Inspectors, Cooperatives. There are fortnightly meetings in the block. The VLWs tell about shortages in the depots and the demands made by them. The Marketing Societies shift materials to the depots. Moreover, sufficient stock is maintained at Marketing Societies to meet the needs of the farmers during sowing time. There has never been a shortage of fertilizer and obviously it is the result of good coordination.”

Use of meetings combined with personal contacts was strongly associated with initiative among all three groups of functionaries—officials at district and sub-division levels, officials at block and village levels, and non-officials at three levels (Table 5.3). Pattern III was also to some extent associated with promptness among block and village officials as well as among non-officials.

More use of this pattern might improve coordination and initiative. Some further suggestions are being made for consideration.

*Frequent contact.* We also saw that respondents who contacted officials or non-officials by Pattern III were likely to communicate with them more *often*. Frequent communication in itself was found to accompany high initiative and often prompt action on the part of functionaries contacted.

Cultivators also gave high ratings on promptness and initiative to functionaries whom they contacted weekly, such as VLW or Sarpanch of the Village Panchayat (Table 5.5). However, they had only a few contacts per year with the BDO, the Extension Officer for Agriculture, or even with Village Cooperative Society. Cultivators rated these below average on either promptness or initiative, especially the Block Development Officer.

*Pattern I: impersonal methods.* An interesting result was found for communication Pattern I—use of impersonal methods of *writing* and *large meetings*. This pattern was associated with promptness of district/subdivision officials. In order to coordinate the work of lower officials and non-officials, it is necessary to reach many people over wide distances. Printed materials or other mass media are a useful way of doing this, in combination with large meetings. Person-to-person contacts would be cumbersome. A single official cannot communicate with enough individuals himself to coordinate effectively.

It is true that the bulk of cultivators are illiterate, and it may also be true that many non-officials have limited ability to read and write. Nevertheless more use of printed communication might prove very useful.

*Pattern IV: personal contacts:* Surprisingly, the use of personal contacts only was associated with less promptness and initiative by block and village officials contacted. The reasons for this are not clear. It might be that the personal relationships were such that one put off doing things or it may be that since it was not written and did not come in the routine files, it was overlooked. Whatever it is, an excessive reliance on personal contacts only is not likely to help in getting things done on time.

The various locations in the communication network, and the implications, for improving the quality of communication are now examined.

### *Communication between village and block*

While coordination at the block level was generally good, coordination between block and village levels was of ten unsatisfactory. BDO and EO Cooperatives criticised the Village Sarpanch (see summary Chart 3.1).

Furthermore, the data indicated that cultivators and functionaries disagreed in regard to the BDO. Officials and non-officials reported him as prompt, and gave lower ratings to VLW and Village Sarpanch (Table 3.2). Cultivators, however, held the opposite view. They considered the VLW and Village Sarpanch as mostly prompt, but not the BDO (Table 3.1). In the Pilot Study also, cultivators gave VLW a vote of confidence (pp. 37-38).

From such results it seemed likely that VLWs and village non-officials were mainly responding to the cultivator's needs, while BDOs were mainly satisfying their block and district colleagues.

Should efforts be made to change this perception of the BDO by the cultivators? Should efforts be made to alter the reputation of VLWs in the eyes of block and district functionaries? The authors believe they should, and that such changes would improve both coordination and initiative.

But these changes could not be accomplished by increasing personal contacts among individuals; that attempt would not be feasible on a large scale. Nor would written communication do much good. The most feasible approach would be more use of large meetings.

#### *Conference within "VLW Circles"*

Periodic conferences in different "VLW circles" between the block officials including the BDO and the cultivators will have many benefits. They would bring block officials in contact with local problems, in a more efficient way than individual visits. They would enable the cultivators to see for themselves what the BDO and other block officials are doing to help them. The block officials in turn could see what the VLW was doing; the cultivators could testify to his efforts on their behalf. Thus the work of the VLW would have more chance for appreciation by functionaries at block and even district levels.

One district official (in the pilot study) reported:

"I get a map of the block, select two villages at random, and go there. I take along six or seven people: VLW, BDO, EO, and call a meeting. Then I inspect the work, sitting

among the people. I say to them, here is the BDO, here is the EO; I ask someone among the public, do you know them? . . . Then I find out from the VLW how much work has been done, what are the problems, how they are to be solved, where do they need the attention of other departments. Then I write a letter to that department."

In such a meeting, persons at four levels are involved: district, block, village officials and cultivators. An opportunity for multi-level contact should be provided for every village in the district at least once a year.

Perhaps circle-wide conference could do even more—they could process loans, distribute fertilizers, improved implements, improved plants or animals, and the like. This type of meeting can eliminate weeks or months of delay.

#### *Communication with Revenue Officials and Cooperative Societies*

Both functionaries and cultivators agreed that the Patwari or Lekhpai, local representative of the Revenue Department, was least prompt relative to all other designations (Tables 3.1 and 3.2). In Chapter III it was noted that coordination between VLW and Patwari was seen as mediocre by these officials, and poor by other functionaries, and cultivators also criticized the promptness of Patwari. Cultivators, officials and non-officials agreed on low initiative of Tehsildar and Patwari, who were said to do mainly "what the government told them" rather than looking for better ways of doing their job.

Functionaries contacting the Patwari made most use of personal methods *only* or of impersonal methods *only*. It is likely that more participation by him in *meetings*, supplemented by one of the other channels, would improve both his promptness and initiative.

Local Revenue officials play an essential part in certifying land holdings for agricultural loans. Red tape on their part can hold up vital programmes. If circle-wide meetings are held as described above, it would be essential that the Patwari attends, and that there be a chance for joint discussion of the Revenue Department in relation to agricultural programmes.

Similar remarks apply to village Cooperative Societies. Functionaries and cultivators had relatively infrequent contact with these organisations, and they were seen as somewhat slow and lacking in initiative by both functionaries and cultivators. Office-bearers of local Cooperative Societies should likewise attend the annual circle-wide meeting in their areas. They should describe what their Cooperative is doing, services available, and how these tie in with agricultural activities of the departments and Panchayats.

*Communication between block and district levels*

It was found in Chapter 3 that coordination was generally seen as good between officials in the same line of command at different levels (district, block, village). Also coordination was mostly seen as good between officials and non-officials at the same level.

On the other hand, coordination was said to be weak between officials who were in different departments and at different levels (the block Pradhan criticised the District Agricultural Officers), for example (see Summary Chart 3.1). Broadly speaking it could be said that among functionaries the weakest linkages were the diagonal ones—that is, between officials who were in different departments and at different levels, or between officials and non-officials at different levels.

How can diagonal coordination be improved? A traditional solution is to reorganize the conflicting units under a single superior, who is supposed to impose coordination on the units under his command.

Such a solution is impossible, as a means of improving coordination between official and non-official bodies. And even among departments the present authors are dubious of its efficacy. Adding one more layer in the line of command does not automatically insure harmony.

What other alternatives are there? Again consider the potentiality of formal meetings. One of the authors attended a three-day conference, at the Department of Public Administration, University of Lucknow, sponsored by the State Development

Department, and covering (he recollects) the division of Lucknow with three districts and 40 or 50 blocks. Attending the conference were Pradhans of the respective block Panchayat Samitis, Adhyakshas of the district Zila Parishads, and some officials from block, district, and divisional levels.

Participants heard talks from divisional and State officials on current programmes and problems and divided into panels to discuss issues and submit recommendations. For many of the non-officials this was their first opportunity for face-to-face contact with higher officials, and the first time their opinions on important issues had been sought.

Such conferences are likely to improve understanding of agricultural programmes and to develop interest and involvement in these programmes by local non-officials. In the authors' opinion it would be highly desirable if, once a year, each block could send some of its officials and non-officials to a division-wide conference to exchange views, information, and problems with other functionaries at block, divisional, and state levels. If this is not presently feasible, then perhaps as a beginning one-third of the blocks on a rotating basis could send its representatives to such a conference once a year.

### *Agricultural Production Committees*

A mechanism with similar objectives is the series of Agricultural Production Committees which existed (officially) in each of the blocks and districts. Our data indicated that only half of the officials and non-officials interviewed had any information about the Committee in their block or district. Among those who knew that one existed, a majority thought it had done only a fair amount or less to reduce delays.

How might such Committees become better known and more effective? One way might be this: set up a rotating invitation list, such that over the course of a year each official and non-official at block or district level would be invited to sit with his respective Committee at least once during the year. In this way, a wide range of functionaries would become familiar with the Committee's work. Out of such sessions, personal acquaintances

would develop which might prove useful in implementing the solutions proposed by the Committee.

Data indicated that frequent communication, by whatever method, is helpful for promoting both coordination and initiative. Procedures such as the above should be established, to insure that every official and non-official concerned with implementing agricultural programmes be involved in formal meetings several times a year, not only with those persons directly above or below him in the "line of command", but also with persons in "diagonal relationships", other departments and systems (administrative, panchayat, or Cooperative) at other levels.

#### *Headquarters communication*

One disturbing fact in the Pilot Study was that half of the communication among officials at the district level was by writing. An identical analysis was not repeated in the main study, but the data seemed to indicate a similar trend (Table 5.2).

For example Pattern III of meetings and personal contact was used by only 13 per cent of functionaries in contacting district officials, and by only 11 per cent containing subdivision officials (Table 5.2). And yet this pattern was found best for both promptness and initiative in contacting district and subdivision officials (Table 5.3).

These facts indicate inefficient communication. At district headquarters in particular, members of different departments are close enough so that they could easily communicate by formal meetings, supplemented by personal contact. But the preferred method is writing—usually the movement of files from office to office, from level to level. This procedure is cumbersome, time-consuming, and inefficient. A given file may stay on a busy official's desk for a week before he deals with it and passes it to the next man. Any one person in this chain may become a bottleneck. Furthermore in this communication by file there is no chance for give-and-take of viewpoint, no chance to settle misunderstandings and arrive at a mutual solution.

If written communication is needed—and indeed it is necessary

to present the facts needed for decisions—more use could be made of carbon copies sent simultaneously to all the parties concerned. When a major problem arises, a meeting would be scheduled of the half-dozen officials involved. If the necessary data can be sent to all in advance, reaching a final decision at the meeting should not be different.

### *Leadership of meetings*

As suggested above, the authors believe that much more use could be made of formal meetings. To lead a meeting effectively is not a simple task. The authors believe that more use could be made of formal meetings. For these meetings to be successful, the need is for effective leadership as leading such meetings is not a simple task.

An effective leader does not dominate, but neither does he abdicate. His role is an active one, for he must see that several things are done: (a) that important topics are placed on the agenda, and that participants know in advance what these are; (b) that time is reserved to consider each topic, and that if necessary discussion on one topic is closed so that time may be given to others; (c) that the loudest talker does not monopolize time, but more modest individuals are also invited to express their views; (d) that as necessary the leader reminds the group of the issue to be resolved, and calls for decisions on these; (e) that individuals understand their own responsibilities for implementing the decisions.

Effective leadership of a meeting, thus, means keeping the issues in view, ensuring that pertinent opinions and facts are considered, that acceptable decisions are reached, and that each person understands the implications for himself, and that these decisions and implications for each participant are recorded in public minutes.

The effective leadership of meetings is a skill that can be learnt. In the training of officials at top levels and also the training programmes in which the non-officials are being drawn, it should be sufficiently emphasised in helping them to achieve the skills of leading meetings.

It was seen earlier that in contacting block and village level officials and especially non-officials if formal meetings were supplemented by written communications, it was more effective. Mass publicity drive in the form of regular bulletins, use of audio-visual aids such as films, radio programmes will prove very effective in familiarising them with the administrative procedures for getting supplies, loans, etc.

### *The question of authority*

In the interviews with officials and non-officials, remarks were often made about lines of authority. Office-bearers in Panchayat bodies thought coordination would be improved if the Panchayat Samiti had more control over the BDO and other development officials. The latter thought they could function better if the Panchayat Samiti had less control over them. Development officials suggested that Irrigation and Electricity be placed under the control of the BDO; Irrigation officials wanted personnel in Minor Irrigation to be under the Executive Engineer and not under the BDO. Agriculture officials wanted the VLW and those in Irrigation, Cooperatives, Electricity, etc., to be under the control of the Agriculture Department.

There is no easy solution to such disagreements. It is seldom feasible to establish a single line of command. Administration of a complex agricultural scheme necessarily means that for one type of activity a lower official must be guided by one superior officer, and for another activity by a different superior. This situation can be difficult, of course, if the two superiors have divergent objectives of timetables. The difficulty is not resolved merely by designating a higher man as "in charge". Such a step does not automatically guarantee harmony. Rather, the two (or more) superiors should be persuaded to agree to a common plan and a common timetable.

As discussed earlier, regular meetings among the several superior officials are helpful in formulating common goals. Naturally one person must be designated as chairman or coordinator. But his effectiveness will not depend mainly upon his power to command obedience (by mechanisms such as writing the subordinate's confidential report or performance evaluation).

An important ingredient will be rather his ability in leadership of meetings (as stressed above).

### *District Planning Officer*

Who should serve as the principal chairman or coordinator for development? In one of the States studied the District Collector delegates substantial responsibility to District Planning Officer for overseeing all development activities. The Collector is the final authority, of course; but development competes for his attention along with judicial, police, revenue, and other functions. The Collector in this State relies on his District Planning Officer as his full-time deputy in development matters.

In a second state on the other hand, the authors' impression is that the DPO is not really "in charge" of development, but serves as an assistant to the Collector. The DPO is not expected to act vigorously in his own right as the principal initiator in development activities.

In the authors' view, the District Collector (or District Magistrate) has so many broad and heavy responsibilities that he cannot, himself, provide the day-to-day communication and leadership that is required. He needs a full-time deputy in charge of development—someone able to act with assurance on his behalf.

### *Some findings on scientists*

It may be relevant to consider findings from a recently published study by one of the authors on conditions governing the performance of scientists and engineers.<sup>2</sup> While the job of the Village Level Worker or the Block Development Officer may seem remote from that of a research scientist or development engineers, both kinds of jobs require dedication, judgment, and creative imagination. High performance cannot be "commanded".

The technical men in this study were least effective when decisions about their assignments were made solely by their immediate superior. Their achievement was higher when

<sup>2</sup> D. C. Pelz and F. M. Andres, *Scientists in Organizations : Productive Climate for Research and Development*, New York : John Wiley, 1966.

decisions on assignments were shared among several positions: the man himself, colleagues at the same level, his immediate superior, and executives at higher levels in other departments sponsoring the research. Better performance was also found when the scientist or engineer communicated with numerous other persons in his own department or elsewhere in the organisation. Effective scientists did not operate in isolation, nor were they directed by a single supervisor. Rather they communicated with a variety of persons at different levels and in different departments.

Now multiple participation in decisions did not mean that the scientist's assignments were handed to him by a committee. Effective technical men, on the contrary, exercised considerable influence on the decisions of their superiors. They were involved in meetings where they could present their viewpoints as well as hearing the views of others.

If such findings have relevance for the job of agricultural and development officials, certain implications follow. One is that the individual's confidential report should not be written by a single superior. Rather, superiors in several departments which concern him should add their comments.

Evaluations should also be based on consultation with those he serves—as cultivators or non-officials. The previous chapters showed that cultivators appeared to appreciate the work of the VLW more than did the block or district officials. Studies are under way at the Department of Agricultural Extension, Indian Agricultural Research Institute, Delhi, on obtaining cultivators' evaluations of the VLW.

However, while evaluations from multiple sources are necessary, it is not sufficient merely to rate a man as "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory". Rather, specific and feasible targets must be set, toward which the man can strive. A "score card" might be developed to evaluate the work.

Another source of motivation has been called in research laboratories "colleague authority". Through meetings and other communication among different departments, common goals and common standards of performance are shaped.

Individuals will strive to maintain performance which will be judged excellent by their colleagues as well as by their superiors.

### SUMMARY

In this chapter an attempt has been made to summarise very briefly the findings of the study as well as to highlight what we consider are the more important findings. It has already been indicated that our purpose was to try to help in expediting the process of administration. Therefore, the attempt has been to try to speculate on their practical implications for the administration of agricultural development and to make some tentative recommendations regarding the improvement of administration.

The main emphasis has been placed on methods of communication. Most officials and non-officials interviewed relied on a traditional mode of writing combined with personal contacts (Pattern II), but this was not particularly effective either for coordination or for initiative. Better results appeared when meetings were combined with personal contacts (Pattern III) or (for lower level officials and non-officials) when meetings were combined with writing (Pattern I). It was also found important to have frequent contacts with officials or non-officials, if prompt action or high initiative were to occur.

The authors, therefore, suggested several mechanisms to improve communication. One was a periodic conference within each VLW circle in a given block, where the VLW, Panchayat office-bearers, cultivators, block officials, and district officials, might share goals and discuss problems. Actual examples of such meetings were cited.

Certain difficulties concerning coordination with Revenue officials and Cooperative Societies might be overcome, if the latter were to participate regularly in conferences of this type.

While coordination was generally seen to be good within the same line of command or among different departments or bodies at the same level, coordination was weak in "diagonal" relations between those in different departments or bodies and at different levels. The authors, therefore, suggest conferences at which block officials and non-officials could meet with district officials

and perhaps those at divisional and state levels to share goals and problems.

The Agricultural Production Committees now set up at block and district levels can help to perform such a function. Their work might become better known and more effective if, over a year's time, a wide number of officials and non-officials were invited in rotation to attend at least one of their meetings.

It was disturbing to find a large amount of communication at district headquarters carried on by means of writing. Greater use of meetings was suggested, preceded by the simultaneous circulation of necessary information to all the parties concerned, rather than the cumbersome desk-to-desk circulation of a single file. More training was recommended in the effective leadership of meetings.

To reach large numbers of rural people, it may be efficient to use mass communication such as display boards in each village, and written bulletins for village and block functionaries. If the overloaded District Collector is not able to take charge personally of agricultural development, he can benefit from a full-time District Planning Officer to act on his behalf.

## APPENDIX I

# A STUDY OF AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES

## QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CULTIVATORS

### *Fertilizer*

1. Some cultivators use chemical fertilizer; some cultivators use compost; some use green manures; and some cultivators do not use such things.

(a) During the last year did you use any chemical fertilizer?  
(*i.e.*, during last 12 months, both rabi and kharif crops.  
Tick closest answer, but do not read alternatives.)

(Yes, used chemical fertilizers)

(no)

(No, not this year, but used previously)

(No, wanted to but couldn't get supply or loan)

(No, but used compost, or green manure)

(Not answered; doesn't remember)

(If *yes*, ask):

- (b) About how much fertilizer did you use during the last year?

(Approximate quantity, preferably in kilos):

(If given in bags, find out weight per bag)

(If any of *no* answers in Q. 1-a is ticked, or not answered, ask)

Have you ever wanted to use fertilizers?

—(Yes; or used previous)—(No; Never wanted) (Skip to Q. 7)

(If *yes* to above): Why did you *not* use fertilizers this year? (Record answer fully)

2. (a) Where did you get the fertilizer? (Tick one answer. If more than one source, number "1" the source where R got most fertilizer, "2" next most, etc.)

(Government depot)	(Not answered)
(Cooperative Society)	(Question omitted)
(Private shopkeeper)	
(Other source):	

- (b) What steps did you go through to get the fertilizer? (List all steps, the person/organisation contacted at each step, and briefly what that person did. If more than one method, describe steps by which R got most fertilizer)

3. (a) To get the fertilizer did you obtain a taccavi loan or credit, or did you pay cash?

(Taccavi loan, or credit)	(Some by taccavi or credit, some by cash or each loan)
(Cash)	
(Cash loan)	(Not answered: doesn't remember)
(Could not get loan or credit, so had to pay cash)	(Question omitted)

- (b) (If got taccavi/credit/loan; ask): Did you get the (Taccavi or credit/loan) for fertilizer on time, or was it late?

(On time)	(Not answered: or doesn't remember)
(Partly on time, partly late)	
(Late)	(Question omitted)

4. (a) During this year, did you get the *right* quantity of fertilizer that you needed, or did you get *less* than you needed?

(Right quantity)	(Not answered; or doesn't remember)
(Right quantity; but wrong kind or too late)	
(Less than needed)	(Question omitted)
(Forced to take too much)	

- (b) Was the fertilizer you got of the *right kind* that you needed, or was it the *wrong kind*?

(Right kind)

(Right kind but not enough, or (Not answered; or  
not in time) doesn't remember)

(Partly right kind, partly (Question omitted)  
wrong)

(Wrong kind)

- (c) Did you get the fertilizer at the *right time* when you needed it, or was it late?

(Right time) (Not answered; or  
doesn't remember)

(Right time but not enough or  
some in time and some late) (Question omitted)

(Right time but wrong kind)

(Late)

5. During the last year, how long did it usually take you to get fertilizer? (That is, time from first step of applying, until delivery).

(Approximate weeks or (Doesn't remember: or  
months) varies too much to say)  
(Question omitted)

6. (If Respondent reported any difficulty in Qs. 3-5 either as to amount, kind, or timing, ask): *Why* do you think, you got less fertilizer than you needed, (or) did not get it in time, (or) did not get (taccavi/credit/loan)?

- (a) Any other reasons for difficulty in getting fertilizer?  
(Record answers fully)

### *Improved Seed*

7. Some cultivators use *improved seed* that is grown by registered growers or imported; other cultivators use ordinary seed.

- (a) During the last year did you use any improved seed?  
(i.e., last 12 months, both rabi and kharif crops)

(Yes, used improved seed)

(No)

(No, not this last year, but used previously)

(No, wanted to use couldn't get supply)

(Not answered; doesn't remember)

- (b) (If yes ask): Of all the seed you used during the last year, how much of it was improved seed—most of it, about half, or a little?

(Most was improved seed) (Not answered, doesn't remember)

(Half)

(A little) (Question omitted)

- (c) For which crops did you use improved seed? (Crops):

(In Q. 7-a any of *no* answer, is ticked, or not answered, ask):

- (d) Have you ever wanted to use improved seed?

(Yes; or used previously) (No, never wanted. Skip to Q. 13)

- (e) (If yes to above): Why did you *not* use improved seed this year?

8. (a) Where did you get the improved seed? (Tick one. If more than one source, number "1", "2", etc., in order of amount).

(Government depot)	(Own farm)
(Cooperative Society)	(Neighbouring farms)
(Private Shopkeeper)	(Not answered)
(Registered grower)	(Question omitted)
(Other source)	

- (b) What steps did you go through to get the improved seed? (List all steps; same instruction as Q. 2b.)

9. (a) To get the improved seed did you obtain a taccavi loan or credit, or did you pay cash?

(Taccavi loan, or credit)	(Some by taccavi or credit)
(Cash)	(Some by cash or cash loan)
(Cash loan)	(Got from own farm)
(Could not get loan or credit, so had to pay cash)	(Not answered)
	(Question omitted)

- (b) (If got taccavi credit/loan, Did you get the  
ask): (Taccavi credit/loan)  
for seed *on time*, or  
was it late?  
(On time)  
(Partly on time, partly  
late)  
(Late)  
(Not answered; or  
doesn't remember)  
(Question omitted)

10. (a) During this year, did you get the *right quantity* of improved seed that you needed, or did you get *less* than you needed?

(Right quantity) (Not answered; or  
doesn't remember)

(Right quantity, but wrong  
kind or poor quality, or late) (Question omitted)

(Less than needed)

- (b) Was the improved seed or the *right kind or quality* that you needed, or was it the *wrong kind* or poor quality?

(Right and or quality) (Not answered; or  
doesn't remember)

(Right kind, but not enough (Question omitted)  
or not on time)

(Partly right kind, partly wrong)

(Wrong kind or poor quality)

- (c) Did you get the improved seed at the *right time* when you needed it, or was it late?

(Right time) (Not answered, or  
doesn't remember)

(Right time but not enough;  
or some on time and some late) (Question omitted)

(Right time, but wrong kind or  
poor quality)

(Late)

11. During this year, how long did it generally take you to get the improved seed? (That is, time from first step of applying, until delivery)

(Approximate weeks or months)

(Doesn't remember;  
varies too much to say)

(Question omitted)

12. (If Respondent reported any difficulty in Qs. 9-11, either as to amount, kind, or timing, ask): *Why* do you think, you got less improved seed than you needed, (or) got the wrong kind or quality, (or) did not get (taccavi/credit/loan):

(a) Any other reasons for difficulty in getting improved seed?

### *Cash Loans*

13. Many cultivators must get loans to purchase irrigation equipment, cement, implements, and so on. I am speaking of cash loans, not taccavi loan or credit for fertilizer, or seed.

(a) During the last *two years* have you applied for any cash loans?

(Yes)

(No)

(No, not in last 2 years, but  
have done so in previous years)

(Question not answered)

(If *yes*):

(b) For what purposes did you apply for loans in the past two years?

(c) Did you receive the loan you applied for?

(Yes)

(Yes, but less than applied for;  
or received one loan, not  
others)

(No—application rejected)

(No—application still pending)

(Not answered)

(Question not asked)

- (d) About what size was the largest loan you received (or if not received, largest loan applied for) in the last two years, for farming purposes? (Read categories if necessary to select).

(Under Rs. 100)

(Rs. 2,000—2,499)

(Rs. 100—299)

(Rs. 2,500 and over)

(Rs. 300—499)

(Not answered; can't remember)

(Rs. 500—999)

(Rs. 1,000—1,499)

(Question omitted)

(Rs. 1,500—1,999)

(If did not apply for loan, in Q. 13a, ask):

- (e) Did you want to apply for a cash loan during the past two years?

(Yes)

(No, did not want. Skip to Q.18)

- (f) (If yes): Why did you *not* apply for a loan?

14. (a) Where did you apply for a cash loan? (*i.e.*, source of funds. Tick one. Or number "1, 2", etc., in order of size of loan).

(Government funds)

(Not answered)

(Cooperative Society)

(Question omitted)

(Bank)

(Money-lender)

(Other source):

- (b) What steps do you go through to get a cash loan? (List all steps, person or organisation contacted at each step, and action performed. If more than one source, describe largest loan).

15. (a) In the past two years, have you received the *full amount* of the loan you applied for, or not?

(Yes, received full amount)

(Not answered; doesn't remember)

(Sometimes full, sometimes (Question omitted)  
not)

(Full amount, but late)

(No, less than full amount)

(Application rejected)

(Application still pending)

- (b) Did you get the loan at the *right time* when you needed it, or was it *late*?

(Right time)

(Not answered, doesn't remember)

(Right time, but not full amount)

(Sometimes on time, sometimes late)

(Question omitted)

(Late)

(Application rejected)

(Application still pending)

16. About how long does it generally take you to get a cash loan? (That is, from first step of applying, until actual receipt).

(Approximate weeks or (Doesn't remember, months): varies too much to say)

(Question omitted)

17. (If Respondent reported any difficulty in Qs. 15-16 as amount or timing of loans, ask): Why do you think you did not get the amount of loan you applied for, (or) not in time?

(a) Any other reasons for difficulties in getting loans?

#### (OTHER INPUTS)

18. Besides fertilizers and seeds, other things may be needed on your farm, or on other farms in this village. During the the last year, have you used or needed any of the following things? Read each. Limit answer to "own farm" if different

from "other farms". Tick first answer if needed but not available).

(Used or  
needed)      (Did not  
need)      (Not  
answered)

- A. Pesticides?
- B. Water from wells or tubewells?
- C. Water from canals?
- D. Electricity?
- E. Improved implements?
- F. Drainage?

What other things have you used or needed during the last year?

19. (For each of the inputs *used or needed*, ask the following; omit if input not needed)

Did you get the right quantity or right kind that you needed of these things, or did you get less than you needed or the wrong kind? Ask about each input in turn, and tick one answer beneath each input).

A	B	C	D
<i>pes-</i>	<i>Wells</i>	<i>Canal</i>	<i>Elec-</i>
<i>ticide</i>			<i>tricity</i>

(Right quantity and kind)

(Less than needed)

(Wrong kind)

(Mixed answers)

(Input not available)

(Question omitted)

E	F	G	H
<i>Imple-</i>	<i>Drain-</i>		
<i>ments</i>	<i>age</i>		

(Right quantity and kind)

(Less than needed)

(Wrong kind)

(Mixed answers)

(Input not available)

(Question omitted)

20. Did you get each of these things at the right time when you needed it, or was it late?: (Tick one answer under each input)

A	B	C	D
<i>Pesti-</i>	<i>Wells</i>	<i>Canal</i>	<i>Elect-</i>
<i>cide</i>			<i>ricity</i>

(Right time)

(Right time, but wrong quantity or kind)

(Late)

(Input not available)

(Question Omitted)

E	F	G	H
<i>Imple-</i>	<i>Drain-</i>		
<i>ments</i>	<i>age</i>		

(Right time)

(Right time, but wrong quantity or kind)

(Late)

(Input not available)

(Question omitted)

21. (If any difficulties reported in Qs. 19-20, ask): Why do you think you got less of these things than you needed, or got the wrong kind, or did not get them on time?

### (CONTACTS)

22. In order to get supplies or services you need for farming, you must deal with different people and organisation.

(a) You have told me you deal with: (read only those following which R has mentioned, and tick under "mentioned" column. In blank lines, add other mentioned by R, including sources of fertilizers, seeds, loans, etc.)

(b) Are there any other persons or organisations with whom you deal, in order to get the supplies or services you

need for farming? (Check "mentioned" on following list, or add in blank spaces.)

Mentioned      Not mentioned

- A. (VLW)
- B. (BDO)
- C. (EO Agriculture)
- D. (Patwari/Lekhpal)
- E. (Cooperative Society Village level)
- F. (Gram Panhayat or Sarpanch)

23. You might contact these people in various ways—such as personal visits, meetings, letters or written applications, etc. We would like to know how often you generally contact these persons, by any of these methods.

- A. (If VLW was mentioned): How often do you have some contact with the VLW, about farming matters? Is it every week, every month, or a few times a year? (If necessary, read 1-2 other alternatives)

(Daily every other day)	(Not answered; varies
(Weekly, 3-7 times a week)	too much to say)
(Every two weeks)	(VLW not mentioned)
(Every month)	
(Every 2-3 months)	
(Few times a year)	
(Less often)	

(Repeat the same question for each of the other contacts who were mentioned, and tick one in each column):

	B	C	D	E	F
	BDO	EO(ag)	Pat	C.Soc.	Panch.
(Daily)					(Daily)
(Weekly)					(Weekly)
(Every two weeks)					(2 weeks)
(Every month)					(Month)
(Every 2-3 months)					(2-3 months)
(Few times year)					(Year)
(Less often)					(Less)
(Not sure, varies)					(NA)
(Not mentioned)					(N Men)

G H J K L

(Daily)	(Daily)
(Weekly)	(Weekly)
(Every two weeks)	(2 weeks)
(Every month)	(Month)
(Every 2-3 months)	(2-3 months)
(Few times a year)	(Year)
(Less often)	(Less)
(Not sure, varies)	(NA)
(Not mentioned)	(N. men)

24. When you contact these persons, you may request something—some service or supply or action. When you request something, we would like to know how far these persons act on your request within the time that you need.

A. (If VLW was mentioned): When you request some service or action from the VLW, does he act on your request on time or late?

(On time, or mostly on time)

(Sometimes on time, some times late)

(Late, or mostly late)

(Not answered; varies too much to say)

(VLW not mentioned, or R does not request anything)

(Repeat the same question for each of the other contacts; ask about each mentioned, and tick one in each column):

B C D E F  
BDO EO(ag) Pat C. Soc. Panch

(Mostly on time)

(Sometimes on time)

(Mostly late)

(Not sure, varies)

(Not ment., no req.).

G H J K L

(Mostly on time)

(Sometimes on time)

(Mostly late)

(Not sure, varies)

(Not ment., no req.).

25. Some officials do only what the government tells them to do, and never look for more things to do. Other officials are looking all the time for more things to do; they try to solve problems on their own, without waiting for the government to tell them.

- A. (If VLW was mentioned): Which way does your VLW do his job—does he do only what the government tells him or does he look for more things to do, and tries to solve problems on his own?

(Only what government tells)

(Looks for more; on his own)

(In between, some of both)

(No idea; or varies too much to say)

(VLW not mentioned)

(Repeat the same question for each of the other contacts mentioned; tick below):

B	C	D	E	F
BDO	EO(ag)	Pat	C. Soc.	Panch

(Only what government tells)

(Looks for more; on own)

(In between)

(No idea; varies)

(Not mentioned)

G	H	J	K	L
---	---	---	---	---

(Only what government tells)

(Looks for more; on own)

(In between)

(No idea; varies)

(Not mentioned)

26. (Optional, if there is time): You have talked of difficulties in getting (mention a few of R's main difficulties and tick the ones you mention):

Fertilizer	Pesticides	Electricity	Other
Seed	Minor Irrigation	Improved Implements	

Loans                      Major Irrigation                      Drainage

What suggestions do you have for improving these matters?

*Factual Questions*

27. Now I have some questions about yourself. What is your age? (Years).....
28. How much education have you had? (Tick highest level completed)  
(Illiterate)  
(Read and/or write, but less than 4 forms of school)  
(Primary—4 forms completed)  
(Matriculate—10 forms completed, or higher)  
(Not answered)
29. Do you hold any positions in Panchayat or in a Cooperative Society? (Nature of position):
30. In your household (*i.e.*, sharing common kitchen and tilling land in common), how many persons are there of age 18 and over?  
(Number of adults age 18 and over)
31. (a) About how much land do you cultivate? (*i.e.*, size of holding cultivated as owner or tenant, by household of which R is head, or by labourers he hires. Exclude land he shares crops or leases to tenants).  
(Approximate area cultivated)  
(b) Besides this, do you hold any other non-cultivated land?  
(If yes) About how much?  
(Approximate additional area):
32. On the land you cultivate, are you the owner or are you a tenant?

(Owner  
Tenant)

(Some land as owner,  
some as tenant)

(Not answered)

33. Some farms produce a large income; other farms produce a small income. Is the income from your farm larger than other farms in your village, or is it the same as other farms, or is your income smaller than other farms?

(Larger)

(Not answered; does not know)

(Same)

(Smaller)

(a) (Interviewer's name):

(b) (Date):

(c) (Time taken):

(Including interruptions)

#### QUESTIONNAIRE FOR OFFICIALS AND NON-OFFICIALS

1. How long have you been in your present post/position ?  
Years and/or months.....
2. To increase agricultural output, various programmes have been undertaken such as use of fertilizers, improved seeds, minor irrigation, loans or credit, and pesticides. In your opinion, what are the more important programmes for agricultural development in this district? (In the following lists, number in order of mention starting with "1", until three or more programmes have been named. If two or three of these are MAIN programmes on left-hand list, stop. But if only one or none of MAIN programmes is mentioned, ask further):
  - (a) What are some other important programmes in this district? (If additional MAIN programmes are mentioned, add numbers on following list in the order of mention).

Number MAIN

PROGRAMMES

(Fertilizers)

(Seed, improved seed)

Number OTHER

PROGRAMMES

(Major or canal irrigation)

(Improved implements)

(Minor irrigation; tubewells, pumping sets, etc.)	(Electricity for agricultural use)
(Loans or credit for agricultural use)	(Improved farming practices)
(Pesticides, plant protection)	(Soil conservation) (Compost)

3. When you are helping to carry out any of these programmes, we would like to know what departments or institutions or individuals you mainly deal with. (General instructions: a given line below may refer to several persons in the same category, such as several VLWs, or several members of Block Samiti, or several Cooperative Societies. However, use a separate line for persons in different departments, such as different Extension Officers.)

- (a) First, consider officials at the village level, such as VLW Patwari/Lekhpal, etc. Which village officials, if any, do you mainly deal with or communicate with? (List any mentioned, but do not repeat question. If several are mentioned, record those with which Respondent has most contact or communication. If Respondent has most contact or communication. If Respondent mentions type of programme in which he contacts this person, write it, but do not ask)

(Type of officials) (Programme, if mentioned)

- (b) Consider officials at the block level, such as BDO, Extension Officer for Agriculture, EO for Animal Husbandry, or other Extension Officers. Which block officials, if any, do you mainly deal with or communicate with, in carrying out agricultural programmes?
- (c) Consider officials at the level of district, or subdivision or tehsil, such as District Planning Officer, District Agricultural Officer, Assistant Registrar Cooperative Societies, Tehsildar, SDO Irrigation, etc. Which officials at these levels, if any, do you mainly deal with or communicate with?
- (d) Consider office-bearers in Panchayati Raj institutions, such as Sarpanches, Pradhans, Adhyakshas, or other

members of the Panchayats, Samitis, or Zila Parishad. Which of these non-officials if any, do you mainly deal with, in carrying out agricultural programmes? (List any mentioned, but do not press. Be sure to indicate level, if not clear, *i.e.*, village, block, district)

(Type of non-official, and level) (Programme, if mentioned)

(e) Consider office-bearers of Cooperative Societies, such as Chairman, Managing Director, or other office-holders. Which of these persons, if any, do you mainly deal with, in carrying out agricultural programmes? (List any mentioned, but do not press. Be sure to indicate level and type of Cooperative).

(f) Are there any other persons or departments or institutions that you mainly deal with in agricultural programmes—for example, cultivators, registered seed growers, blanks, state level department, etc?

4. Next we wish to ask what type of contact or communication you have with each of these persons. But it would take too much time to ask about all of them, so I shall request you to pick out a few with whom you mainly deal, in the various agricultural programmes.

(a) Village officials. If one only was mentioned, tick that line (✓) in margin above and move on. If more than one, ask: Which kind of village official do you mainly deal with—either personally, or in writing? (Tick one only in margin above.)

(b) Block officials. Some instructions: if one only, tick and move on: If more than one, ask: With which block official do you mainly deal, either personally or in writing? (Tick one only.)

(c) District or subdivision officials. (Same instructions, Tick one only.)

(d) Panchayati Raj office-bearers (Same instructions. Tick one only.)

(e) Cooperative Societies. (Same instructions. Tick one only.)

- (f) On our questionnaire there is room to ask about six of these contacts so you may select (one/two/three) more. Among all the remaining persons you have named, which (one/two/three) more do you mainly deal with? (Tick to bring total up to six only.)
- (g) (Now label these six contacts A, B, C, D, E, and F, respectively.)
- (h) (On a separate sheet, copy these six contacts. Explain to Respondent that you are doing this to make it easier to answer. Leave the sheet where he can easily see it.)
5. There are many ways in which two persons can communicate with each other, such as:
- 1st: in writing, such as letters, circulars, telegrams, etc;
  - 2nd: by personal talks between the two of them, inspection visits, etc;
  - 3rd: by formal meetings that are regularly scheduled, with minutes kept;
  - 4th: by informal meetings that are not regular, no minutes kept;
  - 5th: by other methods such as telephone, verbal message through a third party, etc.
- (a) Now consider the official(s) on line A of separate sheet. When you and these persons communicate with each other about any agricultural programme—that is, when you give or receive information, or instructions, or requests—which of the five methods do you most often use? (Rank number 1 on following list. If necessary, repeat the alternatives.) Which method is used next most often? (Rank number 2.) Which method is used third? (Rank number 3.)

RANK

writing

Personal talk

Formal Meetings (Cannot rank)

Informal meetings

Other methods

- (b) Now consider the person(s) of line B. When you and this person communicate about agricultural programmes, which of five methods do you most often use? (Rank Number 1. Repeat list if necessary.)

Which method is used next most often? (Rank number 2.)

Which method is used third? (Rank number 3.)

RANK

Writing

Personal talks

Formal meetings (Cannot rank)

Informal meetings

Other methods

- (c) Consider the person(s) of line C, when you and this person communicate about agricultural programmes, which of the five methods do you most often use? (Rank No. 1.)

RANK

Writing

Personal talks

Formal meetings (Cannot rank)

Informal meetings

Other methods

- (d) Consider the person(s) on line D, when you and this person communicate about agricultural programmes, which of the five methods do you most often use? (Rank No. 1.)

Which method is used next most often? (Rank Number 2.)

Which method is used third? (Rank number 3.)

RANK

Writing

Personal talks

Formal meetings (Cannot rank)

Informal meetings

Other methods

- (e) Consider the person(s) on line E. When you and this person communicate about agricultural programmes, which of the five methods do you most often use?

(Rank number 1).

RANK

Writing

Personal talks

Formal meetings (Cannot rank)

Informal meetings

Other methods.

- (f) Consider the person(s) on line F. When you and this person communicate about agricultural programmes, which of the five methods do you most often use? (Rank No. 1).

Which method is used next most often? (Rank number 2).

Which method is used third? (Rank number 3).

RANK

Writing

Personal talks

Formal meetings (Cannot rank)

Informal meetings

Other talks.

6. (a) Again consider the person(s) on line A, and all of the communication between you and them—either personal, or in writing, or by means of a third person, etc. In general, how often do you and they communicate in regard to agricultural programmes, by any method? (Tick one that is closest to average. Exclude communication on non-official matters. If amount of communication varies widely by season, you may tick two answers, for different seasons).

Daily

Yearly

Weekly (Every few days)

Less often

Fortnightly

(No idea; varies too greatly

Monthly

to say)

Quarterly

- (b) In general, how often do you and person B communicate in regard to agricultural programmes, by any method?

Daily	Yearly
Weekly (every few days)	Less often
Fortnightly	(No idea; varies too greatly to say)
Monthly	
Quarterly	

- (c) In general, how often do you and person C communicate in regard to agricultural programmes, by any method?

Daily	Yearly
Weekly (every few days)	Less often
Fortnightly	(No idea; varies too greatly to say)
Monthly	
Quarterly	

- (d) In general, how often do you and person D communicate in regard to agricultural programmes, by any method?

Daily	Yearly
Weekly (every few days)	Less often
Fortnightly	(No idea; varies too greatly to say)
Monthly	
Quarterly	

- (e) In general, how often do you and person E communicate in regard to agricultural programmes, by any method?

Daily	Yearly
Weekly (every few days)	Less often
Fortnightly	No idea; varies too greatly to say
Monthly	
Quarterly	

- (f) In general how often do you and person F communicate in regard to agricultural programmes, by any method?

Daily	Yearly
Weekly (every few days)	Less often

Fortnightly	(No idea; varies too
Monthly	greatly to say)
Quarterly	

7. Sometimes a certain method of communication will work well, that is, it will give the needed information clearly, and on time. But sometimes communication is not clear, or comes too late.

- (a) Consider all the methods that are used for communication between yourself and person(s) A. In general, do you feel that these methods:

Mostly work well—that is, they usually give information clearly and on time;

Sometimes work well, and sometimes not; or

Often work poorly, that is, they often do not give information clearly, or not on time;

(R has no idea; or varies too greatly to say)

- (b) Consider all the methods that are used for communication between yourself and person B. In general, do you feel these methods:

Mostly work well (No idea; or varies greatly)

Sometimes work well

Often work poorly

- (c) Consider all the methods that are used for communication between yourself and person G. In general, do you feel that these methods:

Mostly work well (No idea; or varies greatly)

Sometimes work well

Often work poorly

- (d) Consider all the methods that are used for communication between yourself and person D. In general, do you feel these methods:

Mostly work well (No Idea; or varies greatly)

Often work poorly

- (e) Consider all the methods that are used for communication between yourself and person E. In general, do you feel that these methods:

Mostly work well (No idea; or varies greatly)

Sometimes work well

Often work poorly

- (f) Consider all the methods that are used for communication between yourself and person F. In general, do you feel that these methods:

Mostly work well (No idea; or varies greatly)

Sometimes work well

Often work poorly

8. In your communication with each of these persons you may, from time to time, make some request. That is, you may ask the person for some service or action, in regard to agricultural programmes. You might make requests either personally, or in writing, or in a meeting, or through a third party.

- (a) What sort of thing you might request from person(s) A? Can you give one or two examples of some service or action you might ask them to do?

(If several, record the more usual kinds.)

- (b) When you make such a request, how far do these person(s) act on your request within the time that is needed? (If answer varies by type of request, ask which is most frequent type, star this (\*) in 8a, and answer for that type. Preferably choose a request that is within the person's power to execute, and does not depend on outside supplies, etc.) Do they act:

Mostly on time (On time, but of wrong type or poor quality)

Sometimes on time

Often late (R has no idea; or time varies too greatly to say)

- (c) (If "often late", ask): About how much delay is usually there? (Check closest of following. If answer varies by type of request, follow same procedure as in 8b.)

(One week) (R has no idea; or varies too greatly to say)

(2-4 weeks, one month)

(Two-three months) (Question not asked)

(Four-six months)

(7-12 months, one year)

(More than one year)

9. (a) Consider person B. Can you give one or two examples of some service or action that you might request from this person?

- (b) When you make such a request from person B, how far does he act on the request within the time that is needed?

Mostly on time (On time, but of wrong type or quality)

Sometimes on time

Often late (No idea; varies too greatly)

(R makes no requests)

- (c) (If "often late"): About how much delay is usually there?

(One week) (R has no idea; or varies too greatly to say)

(2-4 weeks, one month)

(two-three months) (Question not asked)

(Four-six months)

(7-12 months, one year)

(More than one year)

10. (a) Can you give one or two examples of some service or action that you might request from person G?

- (b) When you make such a request from person G, how far does he act on the request within the time that is needed?

Mostly on time (On time, but of wrong type or quality)

Sometimes on time

Often late

(No idea; varies too greatly)

(R makes no requests)

(c) (If "often late"): About how much delay is usually there?

(One week)

(R has no idea: or varies too greatly to say)

(2-4 weeks, one month)

(two-three months)

(Question not asked)

(Four-six months)

(7-12 months, one year)

(More than one year)

11. (a) Can you give one or two examples of some service or action that you might request from person D.

(b) When you make such a request from person D, how far does he act on the request within the time that is needed?

Mostly on time

(On time, but of wrong type or quality)

Sometimes on time

Often late

(No idea; varies too greatly)

(R makes no requests)

(c) (If "often late"): About how much delay is usually there?

One week

(R has no idea; or varies too greatly to say)

(2-4 weeks, one month)

(two-three months)

(Question not asked)

(four-six months)

(7-12 months, one year)

(More than one year)

12. (a) Can you give one or two examples of some service or action that you might request from person E?

(b) When you make such a request from person E, how far does he act on the request within the time that is needed?

Mostly on time

(On time, but of wrong type or quality)

Sometimes on time (No idea; varies too greatly)  
Often late

(R makes no requests)

(c) (If "often late"): About how much delay is usually there?

(One week) (R has no idea; or varies too greatly to say)

(2-4 weeks, one month)

(two-three months) (Question not asked)

(Four-six months)

(7-12 months, one year)

(More than one year)

13. (a) Can you give one or two examples of some service or action that you might request from person F?

(b) When you make such a request from person F, how far does he act on the request within the time that is needed?

Mostly on time (On time, but of wrong type or quality)

Sometimes on time

Often late (No idea; varies too greatly)  
(R makes no requests)

(c) (If "often late"): About how much delay is usually there?

(One week) (R has no idea; or varies too greatly to say)

(2-4 weeks, one month)

(two-three months) (Question not asked)

(Four-six months)

(7-12 months, one year)

(More than one year)

14. In order to ask the next question, we have made up a story about two Block Development Officers. Let us say that one BDO works in a block named Dalabad, and the other works in a block called Grampur.

In Dalabad, the first BDO does exactly what his superior directs him to do but nothing more. He follows all rules,

but he never looks for new or better ways of doing his job. Sometimes an urgent problem will arise for which there is no fixed procedure. In such cases the Dalabad BDO always consults his superior, the District Planning Officer, and waits for instructions before taking any action. In the other Block named Grampur, the second BDO also follows instructions and rules; but in addition he is looking all the time for new and better ways of doing his job. When an urgent problem arises for which there is no fixed procedure, the Grampur BDO will use his discretion in the best way he can, and after this he will inform the District Planning Officer.

- (a) Now consider person (s) A. In general, would you say that they perform their jobs:

More like the first man, (R has no idea)  
in Dalabad, or

More like the second one, (Question not relevant; can't  
in Grampur, or compare these jobs)

Halfway in between them?

(NOTE: Here or below, if respondent seems not sure which BDO is, summarize briefly, using only words in the story above.)

- (b) Consider person B. In general, would you say that he performs his job:

More like the first man (R has no idea)

More like the second man (Not relevant; can't compare)

Halfway in between them

- (c) Consider person C. In general, would you say that he performs his job:

More like the first man (R has no idea)

More like the second man (Not relevant; can't compare)

Halfway in between them

(NOTE: Whenever Panchayats or Cooperative Societies are first mentioned, add): A Panchayat body or Cooperative Society, of course, does not have as many rules to follow as a government official. Nevertheless

is like the first man if it does only the usual things in the usual way, and waits for instructions before acting on problems. A Panchayat/Cooperative is like the second man if it is always looking for new and better ways of doing his work, and uses its own discretion to act on problems.

- (d) Consider persons D. In general, would you say that he performs his job:

More like the first man (R has no idea)

More like the second man (Not relevant; can't compare)

Halfway in between them

- (e) Consider person E. In general, would you say that he performs his job:

More like the first man (R has no idea)

More like the second man (Not relevant; can't compare)

Halfway in between them

- (f) Consider person F. In general, would you say that he performs his job:

More like the first man (R has no idea)

More like the second man (Not relevant; can't compare)

Halfway in between them

- (g) Now consider other persons in positions like you on, that is, other (insert Respondent's designation) in your block/district. In general, would you say that they perform their job:

More like the first man (R has no idea)

More like the second man (Not relevant; can't compare)

Halfway in between them

15. The departments in the districts and blocks carry on a variety of activities. Some activities are of direct help to agricultural output, such as fertilizers in the needed quantity, of the right type and at the right time. Some activities ought to help agricultural output but in fact do not, such as fertilizers of the wrong type or at the wrong time; seeds of poor quality; canals

channels, loans too late or misused, etc. And some activities are not intended to raise agricultural output, such as maintaining law and order.

- (a) Consider the activities of the Planning and Development Department in your block/district. In your opinion, how far this department's activities are of direct help to agricultural output? Would you say:

Almost all of their activities help directly (No idea; no contact with this department)

Most of the activities help (about three-quarters)

About half

A few of the activities (about one-quarter)

Almost none help directly

- (b) Consider the activities of the Canal Irrigation or Major Irrigation Department in your block/district. In your opinion, how far this department's activities are of direct help to agricultural output?

Almost all their activities help (No idea; no contact)

Most (three-quarters)

About half

A few (one-quarter)

Almost none

- (c) Consider the activities of officials who are concerned with Minor Irrigation, within your block/district. In your opinion, how far these officials' activities are of direct help to agricultural output?

Almost all their activities help (No idea; no contact)

Most (three-quarters)

About half

A few (one-quarter)

Almost none

- (d) Consider the activities of the Revenue Department in your block/district. In your opinion, how far these officials' activities are of direct help to agricultural output?

Almost all their activities help (No idea; no contact)

Most (three-quarters)

About half

A few (one-quarter)

Almost none.

- (e) Consider the activities of the Electricity Department in your block/district. In your opinion, how far these officials' activities are of direct help to agricultural output?

Almost all their activities help (No idea; no contact)

Most (three-quarters)

About half

A few (one-quarter)

Almost none

Consider the activities of officials in the Cooperative Department in your block/district. In your opinion, how far these officials' activities are of direct help to agricultural output?

Almost all their activities help (No idea; no contact)

Most (three-quarters)

About half

A few (one-quarter)

Almost none

16. In carrying out agricultural development programmes, Panchayati Raj institutions and Cooperatives may also participate.

- (a) Consider the Panchayat Samiti(s) in your block/district. In your opinion, how far the activities of the Samiti(s) are of direct help to agricultural output?

Almost all their activities help (No idea; no contact)

Most (three-quarters)

About half

A few (one-quarter)

Almost none

- (b) Consider the Cooperative Societies in your block (for district Respondents): "Consider the block-level Cooperative Societies in your district." In your opinion, how far the activities of the Society(ies) are of direct help to agricultural output?

Almost all their activities help (No idea; no contact)

Most (three-quarters)

About half

A few (one-quarter)

Almost none

17. In carrying out the different programmes of agricultural development, many officials and non-officials must work together; each one must do the needed things on time, so that the other persons can do their job.

- (a) Consider the VLWs and the cultivators in your block/district. (If Respondent is a VLW, say "the other VLW"). In the different agricultural programmes, how well do you think they work together—that is, how far each does the needed things on time, so that the other person can do his job?

Mostly they work together (No idea; R has no well contact with these persons)

Sometimes well and sometimes not

Often they work together poorly

(NOTE: In the space below each item, you may add any information R gives as to the activities in which the two persons need to cooperate, but do not ask for this. If answer differs for different activities, ask "which is more important?" Star this(\*), and answer for that activity.)

- (b) Consider the VLWs and the Patwaris/Lekhpals in your block/district. (If Respondent is one of these, say "other VLWs" or "other Patwaris".....)

In your opinion do they:

Mostly work well together (No idea; no contact)

Sometimes well (These persons don't have to work together)

Often work together poorly

- (c) Consider the VLWs and the Block Development Officer(s) in your block/district. (If R is VLW, say "other VLWs", if R is BDO, omit question. In your opinion do they:

Mostly work well together (No idea; no contact)

Sometimes well (Question omitted)

Often work together poorly

- (d) Consider the BDO(s) and Extension Officer(s) for Agriculture in your block/district. (If R is one of these, omit question). In your opinion, do they:

Mostly work well (No idea; or no contact)

Sometimes well

Often work together poorly (Question omitted)

- (e) Consider the BDO(s) and Pradhan(s) of block Panchayat Samiti(s) in block district. (If R is one of these, omit question.) In your opinion do they:

Mostly work well together (No idea; or no contact)

Sometimes well (Don't have to work together)

Often work together poorly (Question omitted)

- (f) Consider the Extension Officer(s) for Cooperatives and Chairman of Block Cooperative Marketing Society(ies) in your block/district. (If R is one of these, omit question. In your opinion, do they:

Mostly work well together (No idea; or no contact)

Sometimes well (Don't have to work together)

Often work together poorly (Question omitted)

- (g) Consider the BDO(s) in your block/district and the Assistant Registrar of Cooperative Societies at district level. (If R is one of these, omit question.) In your opinion do they:

Mostly work well together (No idea; or no contact)

Sometimes well (Don't have to work together)

(Often work together poorly) (Question omitted)

- (h) Consider the District Planning/Development Officer and Adhyaksha/President of Zila Parishad. (If R is one of these, omit question.) In your opinion, do they:

Mostly work well together (No idea; or no contact)

Sometimes well (Don't have to work together)

Often work together poorly (Question omitted)

- (i) Consider the District Planning/Development Officer and District Agricultural Officer. (If R is one of these, omit question.) In your opinion, do they:

Mostly work well together (No idea; or no contact)

Sometimes well (Don't have to work together)

Often work together poorly (Question omitted)

18. (a) Is there an Agricultural Production Committee or Agricultural Coordination Committee in your block (for district level Rs.: "in your district")?

(Yes, or R thinks so) (No, or R doesn't (Doesn't know) think so)

- (b) (If yes) Can you tell me who is on it?

- (c) In your opinion, how much has this Committee done during the past year to improve the working of Agricultural programmes in this block/district, and to reduce bottlenecks and delays? Would you say it has done:

A good deal (No idea)

A fair amount (No such committee)

Not very much

(NOTE TO INTERVIEWER : The next questions 19—22 are open ended. Use as much or as little time as you have, depending on R's interest. Record answers on separate paper as fully as possible, and later copy legibly in space provided. Be sure to answer factual questions 23—28 on last page).

19. (a) (From Question 2 on agricultural programmes, take the first programme mentioned by R, numbered I.) Consider (Number I Programme). In general, how far the various persons or departments in your block/district have worked together well in this programme, that is, how far each of them has done the needed things on time? In your opinion have they:
- Mostly worked together well (No idea)  
 Sometimes well and sometimes not  
 Often worked together poorly
- (b) For what reasons do you think this has happened?
- (c) (If specific example is not given above, ask): Can you give an example or an illustration?
- (d) What suggestion do you have for improving the way this programme operates?
20. (a) (From Question 2, take the MAIN PROGRAMME that R mentioned next.) Consider (this second programme.) In general, how far the various persons or departments in your block/district have worked together well in this programme? In your opinion, have they:
- Mostly worked together well (No idea)  
 Sometimes well  
 Often worked together poorly
- (b) For what reasons do you think this has happened?
- (c) (If specific example is not given, ask): Can you give an example or an illustration?
- (d) What suggestions do you have for improving the way this programme operates.
21. (a) (Optional, if there is time. Take the next-mentioned MAIN PROGRAMME; if none take next-mentioned OTHER PROGRAMMES.) Consider (third programme.) In general, how far the various persons or departments in your block/district have worked together well, in this programme? In your opinion, have they:
- Monthly worked together well (No idea)

Sometimes well

Often worked together poorly

(b) For what reasons do you think this has happened?

(c) (Obtain example or suggestion, if time)

22. One of the things we are asking about is initiative. By this we mean some action which a person takes without being instructed, in order to get something done.

(a) How much scope is there for a person in your position to take initiative? Would you say the scope is:

Good          Fair          Poor          (No idea)

(b) Why is that?

(c) What suggestions do you have on how to increase initiative?

23. Now, a few questions about yourself. How old are you?  
Years.

24. What post/position did you hold previously?

25. (For government officials): What is your total length of service in Government? (For non-officials): How long have you held office in Panchayat institutions/cooperatives ?  
Number of years...

26. How much formal education have you had? (Indicate highest level completed.)

(Illiterate)

(Read and write)

(Primary but less than matriculate)

(Matriculate but not graduate—including diploma, intermediate)

Graduate, general—B.A., B.Sc.)

Graduate, technical—B.Sc. Agriculture, B.Sc. Engineering, etc).

(Member of Administrative Service—IAS, PCS, etc.)

27. (a) (Present designation/position/occupation of respondent—  
that is, position for which he was selected in the sample):  
(b) (Other position(s) he may hold):
28. (a) (Interviewer's name):  
(b) (Date):  
(c) (Time taken):